

CQ

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY
DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
Weekly Report

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART
SOCIAL SCIENCES

VOL. XIX
PAGES 1751-1771

No. 42

WEEK ENDING OCT. 20, 1961

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Committee	ii
and the	1764
etrol	1767
ritical	1770
es	
in	iv
gress	

'Larger' or 'Smaller' Federal Role

*How Parties, Congressmen Stood
On 20 Test Roll Calls in 1961*

Page 1751-63

Drug, Telesatellite Hearings

Page 1765

Pending Reclamation Bills

Page 1766

**PUERTO RICO'S
'CONGRESSMAN'**

Page 1771

Primaries

Michigan 1st

Page 1770

Louisiana 4th

Page 1770

COPYRIGHT 1961

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON 6, D. C. • FEderal 8-4660



What's Ahead?

Dates are listed as released by sources and are sometimes subject to change.

Committee Hearings

- Oct. 25-27 -- PACKAGING AND LABELLING, hearings on practices in the food and related industries, Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subc.
Nov. 8-9 -- THE ROLE OF COMPETITION IN SPACE COMMUNICATIONS, hearings on public policy questions involved in the ownership and control of a space communications system, Senate Select Small Business, Monopoly Subc.
Nov. 13-17 -- THE STATE OF THE RAW MATERIALS INDUSTRY, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Raw Materials Subc., Nov. 13, Riverton, Wyoming; Nov. 15, Moab, Utah; Nov. 16-17, Grants, New Mexico.
Nov. 15-17 -- ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF PERFORMING ARTISTS, hearings on the economic conditions of the theatre, concert stage, opera, and ballet, House Education and Labor, Select Education Subc., U.S. Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City.

Political Events

- Oct. 28 -- PRIMARY, 4th Louisiana Congressional District.
Nov. 4 -- ELECTION, 20th Texas Congressional District.
Nov. 7 -- GENERAL ELECTIONS, New York City Municipal Elections; Virginia Gubernatorial Election; New Jersey Gubernatorial Election; 1st Michigan Congressional District Election.
Nov. 25 -- RUN-OFF primary, 4th Louisiana Congressional District.
Dec. 19 -- ELECTION, 4th Louisiana Congressional District.

Other Events

- Oct. 16-Nov. 2 -- PRESIDENT URHO KEKKONEN OF FINLAND, visit to the United States.
Oct. 22-25 -- INSTITUTE OF NEWSPAPER CONTROLLERS AND FINANCE OFFICERS, Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia.
Oct. 22-26 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS, convention, Marriott Motor Hotel, Twin Bridges, Washington, D.C.
Oct. 24-25 -- NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE, seminar, Indianapolis, Ind.

- Oct. 25-28 -- SIGMA DELTA CHI, National Convention, Hotel Fontainebleau, Miami Beach, Fla.
Oct. 27 -- NATIONAL PLANNING BOARD, Annual Meeting, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
Nov. 2-3 -- FREEDOM OF INFORMATION CONFERENCE, School of Journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Nov. 2-4 -- ASSN. of NATIONAL ADVERTISERS, The Homestead, Hot Springs, Va.
Nov. 6-9 -- HORSE SHOERS OF U.S. & CANADA, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF JOURNEYMEN (AFL-CIO), convention, Park Plaza Hotel, Toronto, Canada.
Nov. 7-9 -- INDIA PRIME MINISTER JAWAHARLAL NEHRU, visit to the United States.
Nov. 9-11 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF PUBLIC SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATORS, 9th Annual Conference, Washington, D.C.
Nov. 11-17 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS, annual convention, Fontainebleau Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla.
Nov. 11-15 -- AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSN., annual congress, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
Nov. 11-16 -- NATIONAL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ASSN., annual meeting, Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans.
Nov. 12-15 -- PUBLIC RELATIONS SOCIETY OF AMERICA, Shamrock-Hilton Hotel, Houston, Texas.
Nov. 13-22 -- NATIONAL GRANGE, 95th annual session, Sheraton Hotel, Worcester, Mass.
Nov. 14-15 -- LIEUT. GEN. PARK CHUNG HEE, CHAIRMAN, SUPREME COUNCIL FOR NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION, SOUTH KOREA, visit to the United States.
Nov. 14-17 -- NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSN., Hotel Sheraton Jefferson, St. Louis, Mo.
Nov. 16-17 -- INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPT. (AFL-CIO), convention, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.
Nov. 17-21 -- UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE, annual convention, Palmer House, Chicago, Ill.
Nov. 23-26 -- BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN OF THE AMERICAS, conference, Intercontinental Hotel, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
Nov. 26 -- AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN., Third National Conference on Medical Aspects of Sports, Cosmopolitan Hotel, Denver, Colo.
Nov. 26-30 -- AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN., 1961 Clinical Meeting, Hilton Hotel, Denver, Colo.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY SERVICE

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth

Senior Writers: Elizabeth J. Brenner, John Jay Iselin, Robert C. Keith, William A. Korns, Carolyn Mathiasen, Helene C. Monberg, Neal R. Peirce.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatmuck, Ruth Hussey, Elizabeth M. James, Gladys Miller, Jonas V. Morris, David C. Niblack, Shirley Seib, Wayne Walker, Donald A. Webster, John Andrew Hamilton, Jr.

CQ Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rathbun.

Editorial Assistants: Margaret Carroll, Charles D. McCamey, Roberta E. Russell, James C. Whittemore.

Publisher: Buel F. Weare.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin, Jr.

Copyright 1961 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

CONGRESS SHARPLY DIVIDED ON QUESTION OF FEDERAL ROLE

The search for a definition of a "Democrat" and a "Republican" almost inevitably leads to a discussion of the parties in terms of their philosophies of Government -- how large a role each thinks the Federal Government should play.

Congressional Quarterly's study of each Member's voting in 1961 on questions of the nature and scope of the Federal Role shows the wide gulf that such questions produce between the bulk of the liberal Democrats and the bulk of the Republicans, and within the Democratic party itself between "liberals" -- mostly in the North -- and "conservatives" -- mostly in the South.

Test Votes

Congress cast 320 roll-call votes in 1961 -- 116 in the House and 204 in the Senate. A number of the questions put to a record vote presented a choice between a larger and a smaller Federal Role. Sometimes the alternative lay between maintaining and enlarging an existing program; sometimes between initiating a program or not; sometimes between maintaining the status quo and diminishing the federal role; sometimes between initiating a smaller or larger program.

For its 1961 Federal Role study, CQ selected 10 Senate roll calls and 10 House roll calls that offered a choice, as described above, between a larger and a smaller Federal Role.

Many of the votes involved the question of federal expenditure. These included roll calls on such major programs as depressed areas, housing, school aid, manpower retraining and water pollution. Others were more a question of federal-state relations. This was the case in roll calls dealing with election reform, civil rights, the Northeast Water Compact, temporary unemployment compensation, and juvenile delinquency. Questions involving business-Government relationships (minimum wage, Mexican farm labor), farm policy (feed grains) and public-private power were also included.

No attempt was made to select votes of equal importance, or to weight those selected to reflect their relative importance. Thus the quantitative results of the analysis, set forth below, are only indicative of a broad situation; to describe accurately the position taken by an individual Member respecting the federal role, account must be taken of his position on each of the test votes.

Party loyalty was undoubtedly a factor in the roll calls considered, as all but two of the 20 roll calls, and both of these in the Senate (civil rights and election reform), found a majority of Democrats opposing a majority of Republicans. Splits within the parties were more apparent in the Senate than in the House, where proportionately fewer members of each party opposed the majority of the party on the votes.

Support Scores

To derive the scores for each Member, CQ determined, for each of the test votes, whether a "yea" or "nay" constituted support for a larger Federal Role or

for a smaller Federal Role, relative to the alternative presented. (This key, showing the meaning of a "yea" vote in each case, is noted following the description of each roll call.) Members were then credited with support for a larger or smaller role for each of the test votes. To achieve maximum coverage, announced stands as well as "yea" and "nay" votes were counted. These were then added to derive the number of times each Member supported a smaller and/or larger role, and the numbers were translated into percentages. The percentage scores for each Member, along with his percentage for the 86th Congress, are shown on the charts appearing on the following pages. As 10 votes were used in each chamber, the percentage indicates the actual number of votes cast either way. (For the complete 86th Congress study, see 1960 Almanac p. 131)

Averaging of these individual scores showed that, in 1961, Democrats as a whole supported a larger Federal Role slightly more than five times as often as Republicans as a group. Conversely, Republicans supported a smaller Federal Role slightly less than four times as often as Democrats.

The average scores for the 86th Congress showed Democrats supported a larger federal role almost four times as often as Republicans, and Republicans supporting a smaller federal role more than three times as often as Democrats.

The average percentage figures for 1961 and for the 86th Congress were as follows:

	1961		86th Congress	
	Dem.	GOP	Dem.	GOP
LARGER FEDERAL ROLE				
Both chambers	76%	15%	74%	19%
Senate	67	32	74	27
House	78	12	74	17
SMALLER FEDERAL ROLE				
Both chambers	22	83	23	78
Senate	33	64	25	71
House	21	87	23	80

Senate Scores

More significant, however, are the scores of individual Members, showing the relative balance of attitudes on the Federal Role within each party in each chamber. In the Senate, for example, 17 Democrats supported a larger Federal Role or opposed a smaller one on every one of the 10 test votes; altogether, 43 of the Senate's 64 Democrats supported a larger Federal Role or opposed a smaller one on at least 7 of the 10 roll calls. Of the remaining 21 Democrats, all but 2 -- Frank Church (Idaho) and Frank J. Lausche (Ohio) -- were from the South. Seven Democrats, all from the South, opposed a larger Federal Role or supported a smaller one on all 10 test votes.

Conversely, only one GOP Senator -- Jacob K. Javits (N.Y.) -- supported a larger Federal Role on all of the

test votes, and one -- Clifford P. Case (N.J.) -- supported a larger Federal Role on 9 of the 10 test votes. Only 7 of the 36 Senate Republicans supported a larger Federal Role on 7 or more of the votes, four more did so on 6 of the roll calls. Of the remaining 25 Republicans, 11 opposed a larger Federal Role on all 10 votes.

Senate Democrats scored as follows:

Supported a larger Federal Role, or opposed a smaller one, on all 10 test votes (100 percent): Bartlett (Alaska), Carroll (Colo.), Douglas (Ill.), Muskie (Maine), Smith (Mass.), Hart (Mich.), Humphrey (Minn.), Symington (Mo.), Williams (N.J.), Young (Ohio), Morse (Ore.), Clark (Pa.), Pastore (R.I.), Pell (R.I.), Jackson (Wash.), Magnuson (Wash.) and Randolph (W.Va.)

Supported a larger Federal Role on 9 of the 10 test votes (90 percent): Dodd (Conn.), Long (Hawaii), Hartke (Ind.), McNamara (Mich.), McCarthy (Minn.), Long (Mo.), Neuberger (Ore.), Kefauver (Tenn.) and Byrd (W.Va.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 8 of the 10 test votes (80 percent): Gruening (Alaska), Engle (Calif.), Metcalf (Mont.), Bible (Nev.), Cannon (Nev.), Anderson (N.M.), Burdick (N.D.), Moss (Utah), Proxmire (Wis.) and McGee (Wyo.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 7 of the 10 test votes (70 percent): Hayden (Ariz.), Mansfield (Mont.), Chavez (N.M.), Monroney (Okla.), Gore (Tenn.), Yarborough (Texas) and Hickey (Wyo.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 6 or fewer of the 10 test votes: 60 percent -- Hill (Ala.), Sparkman (Ala.), Church (Idaho); 50 percent -- Long (La.), Kerr (Okla.), Johnston (S.C.); 30 percent -- Fulbright (Ark.), Lausche (Ohio); 20 percent -- Smathers (Fla.), Talmadge (Ga.), Ervin (N.C.), Jordan (N.C.); 10 percent -- Eastland (Miss.), Stennis (Miss.); 0 percent -- McClellan (Ark.), Holland (Fla.), Russell (Ga.), Ellender (La.), Thurmond (S.C.), Byrd (Va.) and Robertson (Va.).

Senate Republicans scored as follows:

Supported a larger Federal Role, or opposed a smaller one, on all 10 test votes (100 percent): Javits (N.Y.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 9 of the 10 test votes (90 percent): Case (N.J.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 8 of the 10 test votes (80 percent): Smith (Maine) and Keating (N.Y.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 7 of the 10 test votes (70 percent): Kuchel (Calif.), Cooper (Ky.) and Aiken (Vt.).

Supported a larger Federal Role on 6 or fewer of the 10 test votes: 60 percent -- Bush (Conn.), Fong (Hawaii), Scott (Pa.), Prouty (Vt.); 50 percent -- Boggs (Del.), Beall (Md.); 40 percent -- Wiley (Wis.); 30 percent -- Morton (Ky.), Young (N.D.); 20 percent -- Williams (Del.), Capehart (Ind.), Carlson (Kan.); 10 percent -- Dworshak (Idaho), Dirksen (Ill.), Miller (Iowa), Saltonstall (Mass.), Bridges (N.H.), Case (S.D.); 0 percent -- Goldwater (Ariz.), Allott (Colo.), Hickenlooper (Iowa), Schoeppel (Kan.), Butler (Md.), Curtis (Neb.), Hruska (Neb.), Cotton (N.H.), Mundt (S.D.), Bennett (Utah) and Tower (Texas).

As these scores show, Senators grouped at both ends of the test-vote spectrum -- the 17 Democrats and one Republican who scored 100 percent, and the 7 Democrats and 11 Republicans who scored 0 percent -- together comprise slightly more than one-third of the Senate membership.

But for one "deviation" from a consistent line, another eight Democrats and one Republican would have scored 100 percent, and another two Democrats and six Republicans would have scored 0 percent. A variety of issues, most of them reflecting regional considerations, caused these single variations from the extremes. Similar influences may, of course, be found in the test-vote positions of other members.

Four issues accounted for the 90 percent score of the eight Democrats. A position supporting a smaller Federal Role or opposing a larger one was taken on the aid-to-education test by Dodd; on mass transportation by Long (Hawaii) and Hartke; on election reform by McNamara and McCarthy; and on civil rights by Neuberger, Kefauver and Byrd (W.Va.). Opposition to building the Hanford reactor's electricity facilities gave GOP Sen. Case (N.J.) his 90 percent score.

At the other end of the spectrum, Mississippi Sens. Eastland and Stennis were in favor of a larger Federal Role in temporary unemployment compensation, where they supported the all-state "pooling" principle. Five separate issues accounted for the 10 percent score of the six Republicans. A position supporting a larger Federal Role or opposing a smaller one was taken on the Hanford plant by Sen. Dworshak; on civil rights by Dirksen and Bridges; on minimum wage by Miller; on depressed areas by Saltonstall; and on election reform by Case (S.D.).

House Scores

Scores for Members of the House show a higher proportion of that body -- roughly 43 percent -- voting consistently at both poles. Of the 261 Democrats eligible for the study, 101 supported a larger Federal Role or opposed a smaller on all 10 test votes. Of 174 Republicans, 87 took the opposite position just as consistently.

No Democrat scored 0 percent; no Republican scored 100 percent in support of a larger Federal Role. A major factor contributing to the "harder" lines in the House than in the Senate is the nature of House roll calls. Fewer questions attendant to an issue or program are put to a roll-call vote in the House than in the Senate; the House does most of its amending of bills in the Committee of the Whole, where no roll calls are taken, and questions put to a roll call are therefore more black and white -- most frequently on passage or recommitment of an entire issue or program.

Democrats who scored 100 percent were as follows: Elliott, Jones and Rains (Ala.); Rivers (Alaska); Udall (Ariz.); Trimble (Ark.); Cohelan, Johnson, McFall, Clem Miller, George P. Miller, Moss, Saund, Shelley, Sisk, Corman, Doyle, Holifield, King and Roosevelt (Calif.); Rogers (Colo.); Kowalski (Conn.); McDowell (Del.); Inouye (Hawaii); Harding and Pfoz (Idaho); Mack, Price, Shipley, Dawson, Finnegan, Kluczynski, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Hara, Pucinski, Rostenkowski and Yates (Ill.); Brademas, Madden and Roush (Ind.); Smith (Iowa); Breeding (Kan.); Friedel, Garment and Lankford (Md.); Boland, Burke, Donohue, Lane, McCormack and Philbin (Mass.); O'Hara, Dingell, Griffiths and Machrowicz (Mich.); Blatnik and Karth (Minn.); Bolling, Karsten, Randall and Sullivan (Mo.); Olsen (Mont.); Baring (Nev.); Addonizio, Daniels, Gallagher, Joelson, Rodino and Thompson (N.J.); Stratton,

Addabbo, Anfuso, Buckley, Carey, Delaney, Farbstain, Gilbert, Holtzman, Keogh, Multer, Rooney, Ryan, Santangelo and Zelenko (N.Y.); Vanik (Ohio); Albert, Edmondson and Wickersham (Okla.); Green and Ullman (Ore.); St. Germain (R.I.); Bass (Tenn.); Thomas and Thornberry (Texas); King (Utah); Hansen (Wash.); Hechler (W.Va.); Johnson, Kastenmeier and Reuss (Wis.).

Republicans who scored 0 percent were as follows: Rhodes (Ariz.); Gubser, Teague, Utt, Wilson, Younger, Hiestand, Lipscomb, McDonough, Rousselot and Smith (Calif.); Cramer (Fla.); Anderson, Arends, Chipfield, Findley, Hoffman, Mason, Collier and Derwinski (Ill.); Adair, Bruce, Halleck, Harvey, Roudebush and Wilson (Ind.); Bromwell, Gross, Hoeven, and Jensen (Iowa); Avery and Dole (Kan.); Cederberg, Ford, Griffin, Harvey, Hoffman, Johansen, Knox and Meader (Mich.); Judd, Langen, Nelsen and Quie (Minn.); Curtis and Hall (Mo.); Battin (Mont.); Beermann (Neb.); Bass (N.H.); Auchincloss (N.J.); Barry, Becker, Derounian, Goodell, King, Miller, Ostertag, Pillion, Riehlman, Robison, St. George, Taber and Ray (N.Y.); Jonas (N.C.); Short (N.D.); Ashbrook, Betts, Bolton, Bow, Brown, Clancy, Devine, Latta, McCulloch, Minshall, Schenck and Scherer (Ohio); Belcher (Okla.); Dague (Pa.); Berry (S.D.); Alger (Texas); Poff (Va.); Byrnes, Laird, Schadeberg, Thomson and Van Pelt (Wis.).

Another nine Southern Democrats would have scored 0 percent in favor of a larger Federal Role but for one question -- whether the Federal Government should have a voting delegate on the new Northeastern Water Compact Commission. (Only one Democrat -- Otis G. Pike N.Y. -- voted for a move to reduce the Government's representative to a non-voting status.) The nine Southerners with a 10 percent score were: Haley (Fla.), J.C. Davis (Ga.), McSween (La.), Colmer and Williams (Miss.), Dorn (S.C.), Burleson (Texas) and Smith and Tuck (Va.).

In contrast to the Senate -- and probably because of the "harder" nature of the House roll calls -- more Southern Democrats scored high marks in favor of a larger Federal Role. In fact, all but three Democratic Representatives who scored 70 percent or lower in favor of a larger Federal Role were Southerners, and several Southerners were in the 80 percent bracket. The three "Northerners" who scored 70 or lower were Cannon (Mo.), who scored 60 percent in favor of a larger federal role, Hull (Mo.), who scored 50 percent; and Jones (Mo.), who scored 30 percent.

There were 33 Republicans who voted in favor of a larger Federal Role only once. The highest scoring GOP Members were O'Konski (Wis.) and Halpern (N.Y.), both with a score of 70 percent for a larger Federal Role. Next, with 60 percent scores, were Fino (N.Y.), and Merrow (N.H.).

TEST VOTES ON 'FEDERAL ROLE' IN 1961 SESSION

Following are brief descriptions of the 10 Senate and 10 House roll calls in 1961 selected by CQ for its Federal Role study. Each one is further identified by its CQ Roll Call (RC) number. All of the votes, which are listed in chronological order, appear in the 1961 Weekly Report as well as on the following pages. Page references are to stories on floor action in which the votes were involved.

SENATE ROLL CALLS

1. Area Redevelopment. With the advent of a Democratic President and Congress, an area redevelopment bill became law. Since 1958, when the program was first proposed, similar measures had fallen victim to disagreements between President Eisenhower and Democratic Congresses. The Senate in 1961 passed a bill authorizing \$394 million in grants and loans for economically depressed industrial and rural labor areas. The passage vote was 63-27 (D 48-11; R 15-16), March 15, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 11, p. 417)

2. Temporary Unemployment Compensation. The main dispute during Senate consideration of a bill to extend unemployment benefits for up to 13 weeks was over financing methods. Unlike a similar program enacted in 1958, the Administration's temporary jobless pay bill provided for "pooling" funds ultimately repaid by the states. A move to eliminate this provision, putting each state on its own, was barely rejected 42-44 (D 16-39; R 26-5), March 16, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 14, p. 419)

3. Minimum Wage. Opponents of the Administration's minimum wage bill objected to a new dollar-

volume-of-business standard for determining coverage. They backed an amendment substituting a two-state-operation criterion for extending coverage to retail and service trades. But the substitute failed by a roll-call vote of 39-56 (D 20-43; R 19-13), April 19, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 29, p. 659)

4. Aid to Education. The Senate once again showed that it is more amenable to federal aid to education than the House. It passed a bill authorizing about \$2.5 billion in grants to the states to be used for operation, maintenance and construction of public schools and for public school teachers' salaries. The passage vote was 49-34 (D 41-12; R 8-22), May 25, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 54, p. 873)

5. Housing. Before passing an omnibus housing bill authorizing nearly \$5 billion for a variety of programs, the Senate defeated an attempt to delete authorization of \$50 million in grants for a new program of mass transportation demonstration projects. The amendment to delete the program was rejected 44-46 (D 22-38; R 22-8), June 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 66, p. 978)

6. AEC Authorization. Public-power opponents in the House managed to kill an Atomic Energy Commission plan to build a \$95-million electricity-producing generator at its Hanford, Wash. plant. Earlier, however, the Senate rejected a move to delete the authorization by a vote of 36-54 (D 11-48; R 25-6), July 18, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 97, p. 1257)

7. Manpower Retraining. A new federal approach to the problem of unemployment was embodied in an Administration-backed bill setting up a four-year, \$655-million

program for training and retraining unemployed workers. The program, not considered by the House in 1961, was passed by the Senate by a vote of 60-31 (D 44-14; R 16-17), Aug. 23, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 155, p. 1463)

8. Civil Rights. Despite the Administration's reluctance to raise the subject in Congress in 1961, the Senate was given a chance to vote for more federal action in the civil rights field when liberals offered civil rights riders to a bill appropriating funds for the Departments of State and Justice and the Judiciary and related agencies. All of the riders were rejected. One amendment, authorizing federal financial assistance to help localities carry out school desegregation, was tabled (killed) by a vote of 50-40 (D 34-26; R 16-14), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 164, p. 1505)

9. Mexican Farm Labor. Before passing a bill extending the Mexican Farm Labor Program, the Senate agreed to a far-reaching amendment (later dropped in conference) designed to raise farm wages generally. The amendment, which empowered the Secretary of Labor to bar Mexican workers to U.S. farmers unless they agreed to pay them a specified minimum wage, was accepted on a narrow vote of 42-40 (D 34-20; R 8-20), Sept. 11, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 181, p. 1574)

10. Election Reform. Before passing a bland "clean elections" bill, the Senate rejected amendments which would have considerably extended federal supervision over campaign financing. One amendment, which would have required any political committee, including committees operating in only one state, that received or spent \$2,500 to file reports with Congress was rejected 30-43 (D 21-28; R 9-15), Sept. 15, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 191, p. 1632)

HOUSE ROLL CALLS

1. Feed Grains. Before narrowly passing an Administration bill to reduce production of the feed grains most heavily in surplus, the House beat off an attempt to remove the teeth of its enforcement provisions. A motion to recommit the bill with instructions to delete the section giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to reduce market prices in retaliation for noncompliance was rejected by a vote of 196-214 (D 31-214; R 165-0), March 9, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 7, p. 383)

2. Minimum Wage. Opponents of the Administration's minimum wage bill were more successful in the House than in the Senate. The House in effect rejected the Administration's proposals by accepting a substitute containing a watered-down measure limiting new coverage to less than one-third of that asked and setting the new minimum wage at \$1.15 instead of \$1.25. The substitute was accepted on a roll-call vote of 216-203 (D 74-177; R 142-26), March 24, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 14, p. 519)

3. Area Redevelopment. The area redevelopment bill passed by the House was similar to the Senate's, but substituted appropriations for direct Treasury financing. (The Senate prevailed in conference.) The bill authorizing \$394 million in grants and loans to depressed areas was passed by the House 251-167 (D 208-42; R 43-125), March 29, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 18, p. 522)

4. Water Pollution. Before passing a bill doubling federal expenditures to help communities build sewage treatment plants, the House rejected an attempt to modify it in major respects. A motion to recommit the bill with instructions to the Public Works Committee to reduce the new increases by about half and require the states to match federal funds in the future was rejected by a vote of 165-256 (D 21-232; R 144-24), May 3, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 24, p. 756)

5. Housing. Before passing the biggest welfare bill of the session -- a \$4.9 billion omnibus housing bill -- the House rejected a move to substitute a bill extending existing programs for one year, with a \$1.1 billion authorization. The move was rejected by a 197-215 vote (D 39-208; R 158-7), June 22, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 46, p. 1019)

6. Northeast Water Compact. A new concept in federal-state relations was enacted in the form of a compact creating a regional commission to administer the water resources of six Northeastern states. The commission was composed of voting representatives from each of the states and seven federal agencies. Before approving the compact, the House rejected a motion to reduce the Federal Government's representatives' role to a non-voting advisory status. The vote was 140-261 (D 1-233; R 139-28), Aug. 2, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 65, p. 1338)

7. Aid to Education. With all school aid bills locked in the Rules Committee, sponsors put together a truncated one-year, \$325-million construction program and brought it to the floor under Calendar Wednesday. But the House refused to consider the measure, thus killing general school aid for the year. The vote on the motion to consider the bill was 170-242 (D 164-82; R 6-160), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 84, p. 1507)

8. Juvenile Delinquency. The House passed a \$30-million bill for various programs to combat and prevent juvenile delinquency. Before passage, opponents tried to limit all pilot demonstration projects -- which consumed about half of the funds -- to the District of Columbia. They argued that otherwise the projects would be another step in the "take over" of state and local responsibilities by the Federal Government. They lost, 187-217 (D 55-188; R 132-29), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 85, p. 1514)

9. Public Works. Before the House passed the public works appropriations bill, public-power opponents tried to delete funds for the Federal Government to construct transmission lines to carry power from three hydroelectric plants in the Upper Colorado project. The alternative was for the lines to be built by private industry, then leased to the Government. But the deletion move was rejected, 182-225 (D 41-202; R 141-23), Sept. 13, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller Federal Role. (RC 95, p. 1570)

10. AEC Authorization. House public power opponents managed to kill a Senate-House compromise on the disputed Hanford reactor. The compromise, between the Senate authorization of \$95 million and House rejection of any plant, suggested \$58 million for the electricity-generating facilities. But the House rejected this, too, 157-251 (D 146-95; R 11-156), Sept. 13, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger Federal Role. (RC 97, p. 1578)

House Support for Larger or Smaller Federal Role

1. LARGER FEDERAL ROLE SUPPORT SCORE, 1961. Percentage of 10 test roll calls in 1961 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" or otherwise took a position in support of a larger federal role or in opposition to a smaller federal role.
2. SMALLER FEDERAL ROLE SUPPORT SCORE, 1961. Percentage of 10 test roll calls in 1961 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" or otherwise took a position in opposition to a larger federal role or in support of a smaller federal role.
3. LARGER FEDERAL ROLE SUPPORT SCORE, 86th Congress. Percentage of 12 test roll calls in 1959 and 1960 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" or otherwise took a position in support of a larger federal role or in opposition to a smaller federal role.
4. SMALLER FEDERAL ROLE SUPPORT SCORE, 86th Congress. Percentage of 12 test roll calls in 1959 and 1960 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" or otherwise took a position in opposition to a larger federal role or in support of a smaller federal role.

Headnotes

* Not eligible for all 10 test roll calls in 1961.

† Not eligible for all 12 test roll calls in 86th Congress.

-- Not a Member during 86th Congress.

1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4				
ALABAMA					ALABAMA					ALABAMA					ALABAMA				
3 Andrews	80	20	50	33	19 Holifield	100	0	100	0	HAWAII									
1 Boykin	50	30	42	25	17 King	100	0	100	0	AL Inouye	100	0	100	0					
7 Elliott	100	0	67	17	26 Roosevelt	100	0	100	0	IDAHO									
2 Grant	60	30	50	42	16 Bell	10	90	--	--	2 Harding	100	0	--	--					
9 Huddleston	70	30	67	33	21 Hiestand	0	100	0	100	1 Pfost	100	0	100	0					
8 Jones	100	0	83	17	18 Hosmer	10	90	25	75	ILLINOIS									
5 Rains	100	0	83	17	24 Lipscomb	0	100	0	100	25 Gray	80	10	100	0					
4 Roberts	90	0	83	17	15 McDonough	0	100	0	100	21 Mack	100	0	100	0					
6 Selden	60	40	50	50	25 Rousselot	0	100	--	--	24 Price	100	0	100	0					
ALASKA					20 Smith	0	100	0	100	23 Shipley	100	0	92	0					
AL Rivers	100	0	100	0	COLORADO					COLORADO					COLORADO				
ARIZONA					4 Aspinall	90	10	100	0	17 Anderson	0	100	--	--					
2 Udall M.	100*	0*	--	--	1 Rogers	100	0	100	0	17 Arends	0	100	0	92					
1 Rhodes	0	100	17	83	3 Chenoweth	30	70	33	67	19 Chitperfield	0	100	0	100					
ARKANSAS					2 Dominick	10	90	--	--	20 Findley	0	90	--	--					
5 Alford	30	70	33	33	CONNECTICUT					CONNECTICUT					CONNECTICUT				
1 Gathings	40	60	50	50	1 Daddario	80	20	83	17	14 Hoffman	0	100	0	100					
4 Harris	70	30	58	42	3 Giaimo	90	10	83	17	15 Mason	0	100	0	75					
2 Mills	70	30	67	33	AL Kowalski	100	0	92	8	18 Michel	10	90	0	100					
6 Norrell C.	29*	57*	--	--	5 Monagan	80	20	75	17	22 Springer	10	90	0	100					
3 Trimble	100	0	83	17	2 Seely-Brown	50	50	--	--	Chicago Cook County					Chicago Cook County				
CALIFORNIA					4 Sibal	20	80	--	--	1 Dawson	100	0	75	0					
7 Cohelan	100	0	92	8	DELAWARE					DELAWARE					DELAWARE				
14 Hagen	90	10	67	33	AL McDowell	100	0	83	17	2 Finnegan	100	0	--	--					
2 Johnson	100	0	100	0	FLORIDA					FLORIDA					FLORIDA				
11 McFall	100	0	100	0	2 Bennett	80	20	33	67	5 Kluczynski	100	0	83	8					
1 Miller C.	100	0	92	8	4 Fascell	80	20	58	42	7 Libonati	90	10	100	0					
8 Miller G.P.	100	0	92	0	7 Haley	10	90	17	83	3 Murphy	100	0	92	8					
3 Moss	100	0	92	8	5 Harlong	20	80	25	75	6 O'Brien	100	0	100	0					
29 Sound	100	0	100	0	8 Matthews	60	40	50	50	2 O'Hara	100	0	100	0					
5 Shelley	100	0	92	8	6 Rogers	60	40	42	58	11 Pucinski	100	0	92	8					
27 Sheppard	90	10	100	0	3 Sikes	60	40	42	50	8 Rostenkowski	100	0	83	8					
12 Sisk	100	0	100	0	1 Cramer	0	100	8	92	9 Yates	100	0	83	8					
6 Baldwin	40	60	58	42	GEORGIA					GEORGIA					GEORGIA				
10 Gubser	0	100	17	83	8 Blitch	30	60	50	50	13 Church	10	90	8	92					
4 Mailliard	20	60	42	50	5 Davis J.C.	10	90	17	75	10 Collier	0	100	17	83					
13 Teague	0	100	0	92	7 Davis J.W.	70	30	--	--	4 Deruinski	0	100	8	92					
28 Utt	0	100	8	92	4 Flynt	30	50	17	75	INDIANA					INDIANA				
30 Wilson	0	100	17	83	3 Forrester	30	60	17	83	3 Brademas	100	0	100	0					
9 Younger	0	100	8	92	1 Hagan	70	30	--	--	8 Denton	90	10	92	0					
Los Angeles Co.					9 Landrum	70	30	33	67	1 Madden	100	0	100	0					
22 Corman	100	0	--	--	2 Pilcher	70	30	50	50	5 Roush	100*	0*	92	8					
23 Doyle	100	0	100	0	10 Stephens	60	40	--	--	4 Adair	0	100	17	67					
					6 Vinson	70	20	58	33	7 Bray	10	90	25	75					

1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4				
6 Morrison	60	30	50	17	NEBRASKA					5 Scott	40	60	42	58	6 McMillan	40	60	50	50
5 Passman	70	30	58	42	3 Beermann	0	100	--	--	12 Taylor	70	30	0†	0†	2 Riley	20	70	42	58
7 Thompson	40	40	58	17	2 Cunningham	20	80	8	92	11 Whitener	40	60	33	58	1 Rivers	30	70	50	42
3 Willis	40	50	50	33	4 Martin	10	90	--	--	10 Jonas	0	100	0	100	SOUTH DAKOTA				
MAINE					1 Weaver	10	90	8	92	NORTH DAKOTA					2 Berry	0	100	17	83
1 Garland	10	90	--	--	NEVADA					AL Nygaard	10	90	--	--	1 Reifel	20	80	--	--
3 McIntire	10	90	8	92	AL Baring	100	0	92	8	AL Short	0	100	0	100	TENNESSEE				
2 Tupper	40	60	--	--	NEW HAMPSHIRE					OHIO					6 Bass	100	0	75	17
MARYLAND					2 Bass	0	100	8	92	9 Ashley	90	0	67	25	9 Davis	70	30	67	33
2 Brewster	90	10	75	25	1 Merrow	60	20	67	25	11 Cook	90	10	92	8	8 Everett	90	10	50	50
4 Fallon	80	20	83	17	NEW JERSEY					20 Feighan	90	10	75	25	4 Evans	90	10	75	25
7 Friedel	100	0	92	8	11 Addonizio	100	0	83	17	18 Hays	90	10	83	17	3 Frazier	70	30	58	25
3 Garmatz	100	0	83	17	14 Daniels	100	0	83	17	19 Kirwan	90	0	92	8	5 Loser	70	30	58	42
1 Johnson	90	10	67	33	13 Gallagher	100	0	83	8	10 Moeller	80	10	75	25	7 Murray	40	60	17	83
5 Lankford	100	0	83	17	8 Joelson	100	0	--	--	21 Vanik	100	0	75	25	2 Baker	40	60	58	42
6 Mathias	20	80	--	--	10 Rodino	100	0	83	17	17 Ashbrook	0	100	--	--	1 Reece L.	17*	83*	--	--
MASSACHUSETTS					4 Thompson	100	0	92	8	14 Ayres	10	90	25	75	TEXAS				
2 Boland	100	0	67	33	3 Auchincloss	0	100	25	75	8 Betts	0	100	0	100	3 Beckworth	70	30	75	25
13 Burke	100	0	83	17	1 Cahill	30	70	42	58	22 Bolton	0	100	8	83	2 Brooks	90	10	92	8
4 Donohue	100	0	75	17	6 Dwyer	30	70	50	50	16 Bow	0	100	0	100	17 Burleson	10	90	8	83
7 Lane	100	0	83	17	5 Frelinghuysen	10	90	25	75	7 Brown	0	90	0	100	22 Casey	40	60	33	67
8 Macdonald	90	10	92	8	2 Glenn	20	80	33	58	2 Clancy	0	100	--	--	9 Dowdy	20	80	17	75
12 McCormack	100	0	100	0	9 Osmers	20	80	25	75	12 Devine	0	100	0	100	21 Fisher	20	80	33	58
11 O'Neill	90	10	92	8	12 Wallbauer	20	80	42	50	6 Harsba	10	90	--	--	13 Ikard	50	50	67	33
3 Philbin	100	0	83	17	7 Widnall	20	80	33	67	5 Latta	0	100	8	92	20 Kilday	80	0	58	33
6 Bates	20	80	17	83	NEW MEXICO					4 McCulloch	0	100	0	100	15 Kilgore	30	70	33	67
1 Conte	40	60	50	50	AL Montoya	90	10	92	0	23 Minshall	0	100	0	100	19 Mahon	40	60	42	58
10 Curtis	10	90	33	67	AL Morris	90	10	75	17	15 Moorehead	10	90	--	--	1 Patman	80	20	75	25
9 Keith	30	70	17	83	NEW YORK					13 Mosher	20	80	--	--	11 Poage	60	40	42	50
14 Martin	20	80	25	42	41 Dulski	80	20	83	17	3 Schenck	0	100	0	100	4 Rayburn	50	50	50	42
5 Morse	40	60	--	--	30 O'Brien	80	20	83	17	1 Scherer	0	100	0	100	18 Rogers	60	40	67	33
MICHIGAN					1 Pike	70	30	--	--	OKLAHOMA					6 Teague	20	60	50	33
7 O'Hara	100	0	83	17	32 Stratton	100	0	67	33	3 Albert	100	0	92	8	8 Thomas	100	0	75	25
12 Bennett	40	50	75	25	27 Barry	0	100	8	92	5 Edmondson	100	0	92	0	9 Thompson	80	20	75	25
18 Broomfield	20	70	25	75	3 Becker	0	100	0	100	4 Jarman	60	40	58	42	10 Thornberry	100	0	67	33
10 Cederberg	0	100	0	100	2 Derounian	0	100	0	100	4 Steed	90	10	83	17	12 Wright	40	10	50	50
6 Chamberlain	10	90	17	83	26 Dooley	30	70	25	67	6 Wickersham	100	0	--	--	14 Young	70	10	58	33
5 Ford	0	100	0	100	43 Goodell	0	100	0	100†	1 Belcher	0	100	8	83	5 Alger	0	100	0	100
9 Griffin	0	100	8	92	33 Kilburn	10	90	0	100	OREGON					UTAH				
8 Harvey	0	100	--	--	31 King	0	100	--	--	3 Green	100	0	75	17	2 King	100	0	92	8
4 Hoffman	0	100	0	92	40 Miller	0	100	0	100	2 Ullman	100	0	100	0	1 Peterson	90	10	--	--
3 Johansen	0	100	0	100	39 Ostertag	0	100	0	100	4 Durno	10	90	--	--	VERMONT				
11 Knox	0	100	25	75	42 Pillion	0	100	0	83	1 Norblad	30	70	17	83	AL Stafford	40	60	--	--
2 Meader	0	100	0	92	34 Pirnie	10	90	17	83	PENNSYLVANIA					VIRGINIA				
Detroit - Wayne County					35 Riehlman	0	100	17	83	25 Clark	80	20	92	8	4 Abbott	20	80	8	92
13 Diggs	90	0	100	0	37 Robison	0	100	0	100	21 Dent	80	20	83	17	1 Downing	40	60	17	83
15 Dingell	100	0	100	0	28 St. George	0	100	0	100	11 Flood	90	10	100	0	3 Gary	30	70	8	92
17 Griffiths	100	0	100	0	36 Taber	0	100	8	92	30 Holland	90	10	100	0	2 Hardy	60	40	33	67
16 Lesinski	90	10	100	0	38 Weiss	10	90	25	75	28 Moorhead	90	10	92	8	7 Harrison	20	80	8	92
1 Machrowicz	100	0	83	8	29 Wharton	10	90	0	100	14 Rhodes	90	10	83	17	9 Jennings	90	10	75	25
14 Rabaut	90	0	92	0	New York City					15 Walter	80	20	92	0	8 Smith	10	90	8	92
MINNESOTA					5 Addabbo	100	0	--	--	29 Corbett	50	50	75	25	5 Tuck	10	90	8	92
8 Blatnik	100	0	100	0	8 Anuso	100	0	100	0	8 Curtin	40	60	42	58	10 Broyhill	10	90	17	83
4 Karth	100	0	100	0	24 Buckley	100	0	92	0	9 Dague	0	80	0	100	6 Poff	0	100	0	100
6 Marshall	80	20	42	50	12 Carey	100	0	--	--	12 Fenton	30	70	25	75	WASHINGTON				
7 Andersen	20	80	25	67	11 Celler	90	0	83	8	27 Fulton	50	50	75	25	3 Hansen	100	0	--	--
5 Judd	0	100	17	83	7 Delaney	100	0	83	17	23 Gavin	40	60	33	67	7 Magnuson	90	10	83	0
9 Langen	0	100	8	92	19 Farbstein	100	0	75	25	19 Goodling	20	80	--	--	5 Horan	40	60	42	58
3 MacGregor	10	90	--	--	22 Gilbert	100	0	80†	20†	24 Kearns	30	60	25	67	4 May	30	70	8	92
2 Nelson	0	100	0	100	22 Healey	80	0	100	0	7 Milliken	40	40	17	83	1 Pelly	10	90	8	92
1 Quie	0	100	0	100	6 Holtzman	100	0	83	17	16 Kunkel	17*	83*	--	--	6 Tollefson	40	50	58	33
MISSISSIPPI					10 Kelly	90	0	92	8	22 Saylor	40	60	58	42	2 Westland	20	80	8	92
1 Abernethy	50	50	33	58	9 Keogh	100	0	100	0	17 Schneebeli	10	60	0†	100†	WEST VIRGINIA				
6 Colmer	10	90	25	67	13 Multer	100	0	100	0	13 Schweiker	20	80	--	--	3 Bailey	80	20	100	0
3 Smith	80	20	58	33	16 Powell	90	0	67	8	10 Scranton	20	80	--	--	4 Hechler	100	0	75	25
2 Whitten	40	60	33	58	14 Rooney	100	0	92	8	20 Van Zandt	40	60	58	42	5 Kee	90	10	100	0
4 Williams	10	90	17	83	20 Ryan	100	0	--	--	18 Whalley	20	80	--	--	6 Slack	80	10	100	0
5 Winstead	40	60	17	75	18 Santangelo	100	0	100	0	Philadelphia City					2 Stoggers	80	20	92	8
MISSOURI					21 Zelenko	100	0	83	17	1 Barrett	90	10	83	8	1 Moore	20	80	58	42
5 Bolling	100	0	100	0	25 Fino	60	40	67	33	3 Byrne	90	10	92	8	WISCONSIN				
9 Cannon	60	20	42	42	4 Halpern	70	30	67	33	2 Granahan	90	10	92	8	9 Jol. : on	100	0	92	8
6 Hull	50	50	50	50	17 Lindsay	40	60	33	67	5 Green	90	0	92	8	2 Kastenmeier	100	0	100	0
8 Ichord	80	20	--	--	15 Ray	0	100	0	100	4 Nix	90	10	92	8	5 Reuss	100	0	100	0
10 Jones	30	50	42	50	NORTH CAROLINA					6 Toll	90	10	92	8	4 Zablocki	90	10	100	0
1 Karsten	100	0	100	0	9 Alexander	30	70	42	42	RHODE ISLAND					8 Byrnes	0	100	0	100
11 Maulder	90	10	83	8	1 Bonner														

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

COPYRIGHT 1961 CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY, INC.
Reproduction prohibited in whole or in part except by editorial consent

Week ending Oct. 20, 1961 -- PAGE 1757

Senate Test Votes on Depressed Areas, Unemployment Aid, Minimum Wage, Aid to Education, Mass Transportation

1. S 1. Area Redevelopment Act. Passage of the bill, authorizing \$394 million in federal loans and grants for redevelopment areas. Passed 63-27 (D 48-11; R 15-16), March 15, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.
2. HR 4806. Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, authorizing federal advances to permit the states to extend unemployment insurance payments for up to 13 weeks beyond the regular payment period for workers who exhausted normal benefits during the recession. Finance Committee amendment requiring each state to repay advances to it solely from taxes imposed on employers within that state, rather than establishing an all-state "pooling" principle. Amendment rejected 42-44 (D 16-39; R 26-5), March 16, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
3. HR 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Monroney (D Okla.) amendment to revise the committee bill so that retail, service, gas-station, laundry and construction workers would be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act not on the basis of a dollar-volume-of-business test, but only if they worked in an enterprise with retail or service establishments in two or more states (this would have reduced coverage from 4,043,000 additional workers to about 2.5 million). Rejected 39-56 (D 20-43; R 19-13), April 19, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
4. S 1021. School Assistance Act of 1961. Passage of the bill authorizing \$2,550,000 in grants to the states to be used for operation, maintenance and construction of public schools and for teachers' salaries. Passed 49-34 (D 41-12; R 8-22), May 25, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.
5. S 1922. Housing Act of 1961. Lausche (D Ohio) amendment to delete the authorization for \$50 million in grants for mass transportation demonstration projects. Rejected 44-46 (D 22-38; R 22-8), June 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.

TOTAL						DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN					
Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5
Yea	63	42	39	49	44	Yea	48	16	20	41	22	Yea	15	26	19	8	22
Nay	27	44	56	34	46	Nay	11	39	43	12	38	Nay	16	5	13	22	8

1 2 3 4 5						1 2 3 4 5						1 2 3 4 5					
ALABAMA						INDIANA						NEBRASKA					
Hill	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Hortke	Y	N	N	Y	N	Curtis	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Sparkman	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Capehart	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Hruska	N	Y	Y	N	Y
ALASKA						IOWA						NEVADA					
Bartlett	Y	X	N	Y	N	Hickenlooper	X	Y	Y	X	Y	Bible	Y	N	N	Y	N
Gruening	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Miller	N	Y	N	N	Y	Cannon	N	N	Y	N	Y
ARIZONA						KANSAS						NEW HAMPSHIRE					
Hayden	Y	-	N	Y	N	Carlson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Bridges	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Goldwater	X	Y	Y	N	Y	Schoeppel	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Cotton	N	Y	Y	X	Y
ARKANSAS						KENTUCKY						NEW JERSEY					
Fulbright	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Cooper	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Williams	Y	N	N	Y	N
McClellan	N	Y	Y	X	Y	Morton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Case	Y	N	N	Y	N
CALIFORNIA						LOUISIANA						NEW MEXICO					
Engle	Y	N	N	Y	N	Ellender	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Anderson	Y	N	N	Y	X
Kucbel	N	N	N	Y	Y	Long	Y	N	N	N	N	Chavez	Y	N	N	Y	X
COLORADO						MAINE						NEW YORK					
Carroll	Y	N	N	Y	N	Muskie	Y	-	N	Y	N	Javits	Y	N	N	Y	N
Allott	-	Y	Y	N	Y	Smith	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Keating	Y	N	N	N	N
CONNECTICUT						MARYLAND						NORTH CAROLINA					
Dodd	Y	N	N	N	N	Beall	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Ervin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bush	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Butler	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Jordan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAWARE						MASSACHUSETTS						NORTH DAKOTA					
Boggs	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Smith	Y	N	N	Y	N	Burdick	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Williams	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Saltonstall	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Young	Y	Y	X	N	Y
FLORIDA						MICHIGAN						OHIO					
Holland	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Hart	Y	N	N	Y	N	Lausche	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Smathers	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	McNamara	Y	N	N	Y	N	Young	Y	N	N	Y	N
GEORGIA						MINNESOTA						OKLAHOMA					
Russell	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Humphrey	Y	N	N	Y	N	Kerr	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Talmadge	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	McCarthy	Y	-	N	Y	N	Monroney	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
HAWAII						MISSISSIPPI						OREGON					
Long	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Eastland	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Morse	Y	-	N	Y	N
Fong	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Stennis	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Neuberger	Y	N	N	Y	X
IDAHOO						MISSOURI						PENNSYLVANIA					
Church	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Long	Y	N	N	Y	N	Clark	Y	N	N	Y	N
Dworsbak	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Symington	Y	N	N	Y	N	Scott	Y	N	N	Y	N
ILLINOIS						MONTANA						RHODE ISLAND					
Douglas	Y	N	N	Y	N	Mansfield	Y	X	N	Y	N	Pastore	Y	N	N	Y	N
Dirksen	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Metcalf	Y	X	N	Y	X	Pell	Y	N	N	Y	N

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

Senate Test Votes on Public Power, Manpower Retraining, Civil Rights, Mexican Farm Labor, Election Reform

6. HR 7576, Atomic Energy Commission authorization for fiscal 1962. Hickenlooper (R Iowa) amendment to delete a \$95 million authorization for construction of electric generating facilities for the new Hanford, Wash., plutonium-producing reactor. Rejected 36-54 (D 11-48; R 25-6), July 18, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
7. S 1991, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961. Passage of the bill authorizing \$655 million for training unemployed workers. Passed 60-31 (D 44-14; R 16-17), Aug. 23, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.
8. HR 7371, State-Justice-Judiciary funds for fiscal 1962. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table (kill) Keating (R N.Y.) amendment authorizing federal financial assistance to help localities carry out school desegregation. Tabling motion

agreed to 50-40 (D 34-26; R 16-14), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.

9. HR 2010, Amend and extend for two years the Mexican Farm Labor Program. McCarthy (D Minn.) amendment to require employers of Mexican laborers imported under PI 82-78 to pay them at least 90 percent of the state average farm wage or 90 percent of the national average farm wage, whichever was less. Agreed to 42-40 (D 34-20; R 8-20), Sept. 11, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.
10. S 2426, The Federal Elections Act of 1961. Long (D Mo.) amendment to require any political committee, including committees operating in only one state, that received or spent \$2,500 to file reports with Congress. Rejected 30-43 (D 21-28; R 9-15), Sept. 15, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.

TOTAL						DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN					
Vote No.	6	7	8	9	10	Vote No.	6	7	8	9	10	Vote No.	6	7	8	9	10
Yea	36	60	50	42	30	Yea	11	44	34	34	21	Yea	25	16	16	8	9
Nay	54	31	40	40	43	Nay	48	14	26	20	28	Nay	6	17	14	20	15

6	7	8	9	10	6	7	8	9	10	6	7	8	9	10					
ALABAMA					INDIANA					NEBRASKA									
Hill	N	Y	Y	N	N	Hartke	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	X					
Sparkman	N	Y	Y	N	N	Capehart	Y	Y	N	N	-	Hruska	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
ALASKA					IOWA					NEVADA									
Bartlett	N	Y	N	Y	✓	Hickenlooper	Y	N	?	X	N	Bible	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	
Gruening	N	✓	Y	Y	✓	Miller	Y	N	Y	?	N	Cannon	N	?	Y	Y	N	N	
ARIZONA					KANSAS					NEW HAMPSHIRE									
Hayden	N	Y	Y	X	N	Carlson	Y	?	?	N	?	Bridges	Y	?	-	?	?	?	
Goldwater	Y	X	Y	N	-	Schoeppel	Y	N	Y	N	?	Cotton	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	
ARKANSAS					KENTUCKY					NEW JERSEY									
Fulbright	N	N	Y	N	N	Cooper	-	Y	N	N	N	Williams	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
McClellan	Y	N	Y	N	N	Morton	Y	Y	N	N	-	Case	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
CALIFORNIA					LOUISIANA					NEW MEXICO									
Engle	N	Y	N	N	N	Ellender	✓	N	Y	N	N	Anderson	N	Y	✓	?	Y	Y	
Kucbel	N	Y	N	N	✓	Long	Y	Y	Y	X	N	Chavez	X	?	?	?	X	X	
COLORADO					MAINE					NEW YORK									
Carroll	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Muskie	N	Y	N	Y	✓	Javits	N	Y	N	✓	Y	Y	
Allott	Y	N	Y	N	-	Smith	N	Y	N	N	Y	Keating	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
CONNECTICUT					MARYLAND					NORTH CAROLINA									
Dodd	N	?	X	Y	Y	Beall	✓	Y	N	✓	N	Ervin	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	
Bush	Y	Y	X	Y	?	Butler	Y	N	?	?	N	Jordan	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	
DELAWARE					MASSACHUSETTS					NORTH DAKOTA									
Baggs	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Smith	N	Y	N	✓	Y	Burdick	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	
Williams	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Saltonstall	Y	N	Y	N	N	Young	N	N	Y	N	N	N	
FLORIDA					MICHIGAN					OHIO									
Holland	Y	N	Y	N	N	Hart	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Lausche	N	N	N	✓	X	X	
Smathers	Y	N	Y	N	N	McNamara	N	Y	N	Y	N	Young	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
GEORGIA					MINNESOTA					OKLAHOMA									
Russell	Y	N	Y	N	N	Humphrey	N	Y	N	Y	✓	Kerr	N	Y	Y	X	N	N	
Talmadge	Y	Y	Y	N	N	McCarthy	N	Y	N	Y	N	Monroney	N	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
HAWAII					MISSISSIPPI					OREGON									
Long	-	Y	N	Y	Y	Eastland	N	N	Y	N	N	Morse	N	Y	N	Y	✓	Y	
Fong	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Stennis	N	N	Y	N	N	Neuberger	N	Y	Y	✓	Y	Y	
IDAHOO					MISSOURI					PENNSYLVANIA									
Church	N	Y	Y	N	N	Long	N	?	N	?	Y	Clark	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Dworsbak	N	N	Y	N	N	Symington	N	Y	N	Y	✓	Scott	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	
ILLINOIS					MONTANA					RHODE ISLAND									
Douglas	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Mansfield	X	Y	Y	X	N	Pastore	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Dirksen	✓	N	N	N	N	Metcalf	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Pell	X	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	

Y Record Vote For (yea).
✓ Paired For.
‡ Announced For, CQ Poll For.
N Record Vote Against (nay).
X Paired Against.
- Announced Against, CQ Poll Against.
? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.

6 7 8 9 10

SOUTH CAROLINA

Johnston N Y Y N X
Thurmond Y N Y N N

SOUTH DAKOTA

Case Y N Y N Y
Mundt Y N Y N Y

TENNESSEE

Gore N Y Y Y ✓
Kefauver N Y Y Y Y

TEXAS

Yarborough N Y ? N X
Tower Y N Y N -

UTAH

Moss N Y Y Y N
Bennett Y N ✓ N N

VERMONT

Aiken N Y N Y Y
Prouty ? Y N ✓ Y

VIRGINIA

Byrd Y N Y N X
Robertson Y N Y N X

WASHINGTON

Jackson N Y N Y Y
Magnuson N Y N Y ?

WEST VIRGINIA

Byrd N Y Y Y Y
Randolph N Y N Y Y

WISCONSIN

Proxmire N Y N Y Y
Wiley ? Y Y Y ?

WYOMING

Hickey N Y Y Y X
McGee N Y Y Y N

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

House Test Votes on Feed Grains, Minimum Wage, Depressed Areas, Water Pollution, Housing

1. HR 4510. Administration's emergency feed grains program for 1961, providing for a rise in price supports for feed grains, payments in cash and kind for farmers who reduced acreage of corn and grain sorghums, and loss of eligibility for price supports for farmers who did not reduce acreage. McIntire (R Maine) motion to recommit the bill with instructions to delete Section 3. Section 3 permitted the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to drive down the market price so that non-participants would not be protected by the price-support umbrella, to sell Government-owned corn and grain sorghums on the market at below the price-support price. Recommittal motion rejected, 196-214 (D 31-214; R 165-0), March 9, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
2. HR 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Committee version, raising the minimum wage for 23.9 million workers already covered from \$1 an hour to \$1.25 in two steps, and extending minimum wage and overtime coverage to 4,311,000 additional workers. Ayres (R Ohio)-Kitchin (D N.C.) amendment substituting a new text raising the minimum for the 23.9 million covered workers to \$1.15 an hour, and extending minimum-wage coverage (at \$1 an hour) but not overtime coverage to 1,300,000 additional workers. Agreed to 216-203 (D 74-177; R 142-26), March 24, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
3. S 1. Area Redevelopment Act. Passage of the \$394 million bill. Passed 251-167 (D 208-42; R 43-125), March 29, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.
4. HR 6441. Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, increasing the annual authorization for federal grants to help communities construct sewage treatment plants from \$50 million to \$100 million and the over-all limit from \$500 million to \$1 billion. Cramer (R Fla.) motion to recommit the bill with instructions to reduce the annual authorization to \$75 million and the over-all limit to \$750 million and require that after June 30, 1964 grants in any one fiscal year exceeding the original \$50 million allotment be matched by the states. Rejected 165-256 (D 21-232; R 144-24), May 3, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
5. HR 6028. Housing Act of 1961. McDonough (R Calif.) motion to recommit the bill with instructions to substitute a bill extending existing programs for one year, with a \$1.1 billion authorization. Rejected 197-215 (D 39-208; R 158-7), June 22, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.

TOTAL						DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN					
Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5
Yea	196	216	251	165	197	Yea	31	74	208	21	39	Yea	165	142	43	144	158
Nay	214	203	167	256	215	Nay	214	177	42	232	208	Nay	0	26	125	24	7

1 2 3 4 5						1 2 3 4 5						1 2 3 4 5						- KEY -					
ALABAMA						ALABAMA						ALABAMA						Y Record Vote For (yea).					
3 Andrews	N	Y	Y	N	N	19 Holifield	N	N	Y	N	N	AL Inouye	N	N	Y	N	N	✓ Paired For.					
1 Boykin	N	Y	Y	N	N	17 King	N	N	Y	N	N	IDAHO						‡ Announced For, CQ Poll For.					
7 Elliott	N	N	Y	N	N	26 Roosevelt	N	N	Y	N	X	2 Harding	N	N	Y	N	N	N Record Vote Against (nay).					
2 Grant	N	Y	Y	N	?	16 Bell	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Post	N	N	Y	N	N	X Paired Against.					
9 Huddleston	N	N	Y	N	N	21 Hiestand	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	ILLINOIS						- Announced Against, CQ Poll Against.					
8 Jones	N	N	Y	N	N	18 Hosmer	X	Y	N	Y	✓	25 Gray	N	N	Y	N	N	? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.					
5 Rains	N	N	Y	N	N	24 Lipscomb	✓	Y	N	Y	Y	21 Mack	N	N	Y	N	N						
4 Roberts	N	N	Y	N	X	15 McDonough	Y	‡	X	Y	Y	24 Price	N	N	Y	N	N						
6 Selden	N	Y	Y	N	N	25 Rousselot	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	23 Shipley	N	N	Y	N	N						
ALASKA						20 Smith	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	16 Anderson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
AL Rivers	N	N	Y	N	N	COLORADO						17 Arends	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
ARIZONA						4 Aspinall	N	N	Y	N	N	19 Chipfield	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
2 Udall M.					N	1 Rogers	N	N	Y	N	N	20 Findley	Y	Y	N	?	Y						
1 Rhodes	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	3 Chenoweth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	14 Hoffman	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
ARKANSAS						2 Dominick	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	15 Mason	Y	Y	N	Y	✓						
5 Alford	Y	Y	N	N	Y	CONNECTICUT						18 Michel	Y	Y	N	Y	✓						
1 Gathings	N	Y	N	N	Y	1 Daddario	N	N	Y	N	N	22 Springer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
4 Harris	N	Y	Y	N	N	3 Gioia	N	N	Y	N	N	Chicago Cook County											
2 Mills	N	Y	Y	N	N	AL Kowalski	N	N	Y	N	N	1 Dawson	N	N	Y	N	N						
6 Norrell C.					✓	5 Monagan	N	N	Y	N	N	12 Finnegan	N	N	Y	N	N						
3 Trimble	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Seely-Brown	Y	N	Y	N	Y	5 Kluczynski	N	N	Y	N	N						
CALIFORNIA						4 Sibal	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Libonati	N	N	Y	N	N						
7 Cohelan	N	N	Y	N	N	DELAWARE						3 Murphy	N	N	Y	N	N						
14 Hagen	Y	N	Y	N	N	AL McDowell	N	N	Y	N	N	6 O'Brien	N	N	Y	N	N						
2 Johnson	N	N	Y	N	N	FLORIDA						2 O'Hara	N	N	Y	N	N						
11 McFall	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Bennett	N	Y	Y	N	N	11 Pucinski	N	N	Y	N	N						
1 Miller C.W.	N	N	Y	N	N	4 Fascell	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Rostenkowski	N	N	Y	N	N						
8 Miller G.P.	N	N	Y	N	X	7 Haley	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	9 Yates	N	N	Y	N	N						
3 Moss	N	N	Y	N	N	5 Herlong	Y	Y	N	Y	N	13 Church	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
29 Saund	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Matthews	N	Y	Y	N	N	10 Collier	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
5 Shelley	N	N	Y	N	N	6 Rogers	N	Y	Y	N	N	4 Derwinski	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
27 Sheppard	N	X	Y	N	X	3 Sikes	N	Y	Y	N	N	INDIANA											
12 Sisk	N	N	Y	N	N	1 Cramer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	3 Brademas	N	N	Y	N	N						
6 Baldwin	Y	N	N	Y	Y	GEORGIA						8 Denton	N	N	Y	N	N						
10 Gubser	Y	Y	N	Y	✓	8 Blitch	?	Y	N	N	N	1 Madden	N	N	Y	N	N						
4 Mailliard	Y	N	N	Y	Y	5 Davis J.C.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	5 Roush											
13 Teague	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Davis J.W.	Y	Y	N	N	N	4 Adair	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
28 Utt	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Flynt	N	Y	Y	N	?	7 Bray	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
30 Wilson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	3 Forrester	N	Y	N	N	?	11 Bruce	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
9 Younger	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Hagan	N	Y	Y	-	N	2 Halleck	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
Los Angeles Co.						9 Landrum	N	✓	Y	N	N	10 Harvey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
22 Corman	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Pilcher	N	Y	Y	N	N	6 Roudsbush	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
23 Doyle	N	N	Y	N	N	10 Stephens	N	Y	N	N	N	9 Wilson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
						6 Vinson	N	N	Y	N	N												

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
6 Morrison	/	N	Y	N	N	NEBRASKA						5 Scott	N	Y	X	N	Y	6 McMillan	N	Y	N	N	N
5 Passman	N	N	Y	-	Y	3 Beermann	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	12 Taylor	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Riley	N	Y	N	N	?
7 Thompson	Y	?	Y	N	Y	2 Cunningham	Y	N	N	Y	Y	11 Whitener	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 Rivers	N	Y	N	N	Y
3 Willis	Y	Y	/	N	Y	4 Martin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	10 Jonas	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	SOUTH DAKOTA					
MAINE						1 Weaver	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	NORTH DAKOTA						2 Berry	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
1 Garland	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NEVADA						AL Nygaard	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Reifel	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 McIntire	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	AL Boring	N	N	Y	N	N	AL Short	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	TENNESSEE					
2 Tupper	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NEW HAMPSHIRE						OHIO						6 Bass	N	N	Y	N	N
MARYLAND						2 Bass	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	9 Ashley	N	N	Y	N	N	9 Davis	N	Y	N	N	N
2 Brewster	Y	N	Y	N	N	1 Merrow	Y	N	Y	N	?	11 Cook	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Everett	N	Y	Y	N	N
4 Fallon	X	N	Y	N	N	NEW JERSEY						20 Feighn	N	N	Y	N	N	4 Ewins	N	Y	Y	N	N
7 Friedel	N	N	Y	N	N	11 Addonizio	N	N	Y	N	N	18 Hays	N	N	Y	N	N	3 Frazier	N	Y	Y	N	N
3 Garmatz	N	N	Y	N	N	14 Daniels	N	N	Y	N	N	19 Kirwan	?	N	Y	N	N	5 Loser	N	Y	Y	N	N
1 Johnson	N	N	Y	N	N	13 Gallagher	N	N	Y	N	N	10 Moeller	N	N	Y	N	N	7 Murray	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Lankford	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Joelson	N	N	Y	N	N	21 Vanik	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Baker	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Mathias	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10 Rodino	N	N	Y	N	N	17 Ashbrook	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Reece L.					Y
MASSACHUSETTS						4 Thompson	N	N	Y	N	N	14 Ayres	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	TEXAS					
2 Boland	N	N	Y	N	N	3 Auchincloss	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	8 Betts	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	3 Beckworth	Y	Y	Y	N	N
13 Burke	N	N	Y	N	N	1 Cabill	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	22 Bolton	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	2 Brooks	N	Y	Y	N	N
4 Donohue	N	N	Y	N	N	6 Dwyer	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	16 Bow	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	17 Burleson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
7 Lane	N	N	Y	N	N	5 Frelinghuysen	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Brown	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	22 Casey	Y	Y	N	N	N
8 Macdonald	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Glenn	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Clancy	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Dowdy	N	Y	N	Y	Y
12 McCormack	N	N	Y	N	N	9 Osners	Y	N	N	Y	Y	12 Devine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21 Fisher	N	Y	N	Y	Y
11 O'Neill	N	N	Y	N	N	12 Walbauer	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	6 Harsha	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	13 Ikard	N	?	Y	N	N
3 Philbin	N	N	Y	N	N	7 Widnall	Y	N	N	Y	Y	5 Latta	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	20 Kilday	Y	/	/	N	N
6 Bates	Y	N	N	Y	Y	NEW MEXICO						4 McCulloch	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	15 Kilgore	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
1 Conte	Y	N	N	Y	Y	AL Montoya	Y	N	Y	N	N	23 Minshall	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	19 Mahan	N	Y	Y	N	N
10 Curtis	Y	N	N	Y	Y	AL Morris	Y	N	Y	N	N	15 Moorehead	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 Patman	N	Y	N	N	N
9 Keith	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NEW YORK						13 Mosher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11 Poage	N	Y	N	N	N
14 Martin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	41 Dulski	N	N	Y	Y	N	3 Schenck	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Rayburn	N	Y	N	Y	Y
5 Morse	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	30 O'Brien	N	N	Y	Y	N	1 Scherer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	18 Rogers	Y	Y	N	Y	N
MICHIGAN						1 Pike	N	N	Y	N	N	OKLAHOMA						16 Rutherford	Y	Y	N	N	N
7 O'Hara	N	N	Y	N	N	32 Stratton	N	N	Y	N	N	3 Albert	N	N	Y	N	N	6 Teague	Y	Y	N	Y	?
12 Bennett	Y	N	Y	N	?	27 Barry	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	2 Edmondson	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Thomas	N	Y	Y	N	N
18 Broomefield	Y	Y	N	-	Y	3 Becker	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	5 Jarman	N	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Thompson	N	Y	Y	N	N
10 Cederberg	Y	Y	N	Y	/	2 Derounian	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Steed	X	N	Y	N	Y	10 Thornberry	N	N	Y	N	N
6 Chamberlain	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	26 Dooley	/	Y	N	N	Y	1 Wickersham	N	N	Y	N	Y	12 Wright	?	?	?	N	N
5 Ford	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	43 Goddell	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Belcher	/	Y	N	Y	Y	14 Young	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Griffin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	33 Kilburn	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	OREGON						5 Alger	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
8 Harvey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	31 King	Y	/	N	Y	Y	3 Green	N	N	Y	N	X	UTAH					
4 Hoffman	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	40 Miller	Y	/	N	Y	Y	2 Ullman	N	N	Y	N	N	2 King	N	N	Y	N	N
3 Jobansen	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	39 Ostertag	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Durno	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	1 Peterson	N	N	Y	N	N
11 Knox	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	42 Pillion	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Norblad	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VERMONT					
2 Meader	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	34 Pirnie	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PENNSYLVANIA						AL Stafford	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Detroit - Wayne County						35 Riehlman	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	25 Clark	N	N	Y	N	N	VIRGINIA					
13 Diggs	-	N	Y	N	N	37 Robison	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	21 Dent	N	N	Y	N	N	4 Abbitt	N	Y	N	Y	Y
15 Dingell	N	N	Y	N	N	28 St. George	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	11 Flood	N	N	Y	N	N	1 Downing	N	Y	Y	Y	N
17 Griffiths	N	N	Y	N	N	36 Taber	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	30 Holland	N	N	Y	N	N	3 Gary	N	Y	Y	N	Y
16 Lesinski	X	N	Y	N	N	38 Weis	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	28 Moorhead	N	N	Y	N	Y	2 Hardy	N	Y	Y	N	N
1 Machrowicz	N	N	Y	-	N	29 Wharton	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	26 Morgan	N	N	Y	N	N	7 Harrison	N	Y	X	Y	Y
14 Rabaut	X	X	Y	N	N	New York City						14 Rhodes	N	N	Y	N	N	9 Jennings	N	Y	Y	N	N
MINNESOTA						5 Addabbo	N	N	Y	N	N	15 Walter	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Smith	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Blatnik	N	N	Y	N	N	8 Anfuoso	N	N	Y	N	N	29 Corbett	Y	N	Y	N	Y	5 Tuck	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
4 Karth	N	N	Y	N	N	24 Buckley	X	X	/	N	X	8 Curtin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	10 Broyhill	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
6 Marshall	N	Y	Y	N	N	12 Carey	N	N	Y	?	N	9 Dague	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	6 Poff	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
7 Andersen	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	11 Celler	N	N	Y	N	X	12 Fenton	Y	Y	Y	N	N	WASHINGTON					
5 Judd	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Delaney	N	N	Y	N	N	23 Fulton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	3 Hansen	N	N	Y	N	N
9 Langen	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	19 Farstein	N	N	Y	N	N	27 Galt	Y	Y	N	N	Y	7 Magnuson	N	N	Y	N	N
3 MacGregor	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	23 Gilbert	N	N	Y	N	N	19 Goodling	Y	Y	N	N	N	5 Horam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Nelsen	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	22 Healey	N	N	Y	N	N	24 Kearns	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	4 May	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
1 Quie	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	6 Holtzman	N	N	Y	N	N	7 Milliken	Y	N	Y	N	Y	1 Pelly	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
MISSISSIPPI						10 Kelly	N	N	Y	N	N	16 Kunkel	Y	N	Y	N	Y	6 Tollefson	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
1 Abernethy	N	Y	Y	N	Y	9 Keogh	N	N	Y	N	N	22 Saylor	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Westland	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
6 Colmer	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	13 Multer	N	N	Y	N	N	17 Schneebeli	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	WEST VIRGINIA					
3 Smith	N	Y	Y	N	N	16 Powell	N	N	Y	N	N	13 Schweiher	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Bailey	Y	N	Y	N	N
2 Whitten	N	Y	N	N	Y	14 Rooney	N	N	Y	?	N	10 Scranton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Hechler	N	N	Y	N	N
4 Williams	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	20 Ryan	N	N	Y	N	N	20 Van Zandt	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Kee	N	N	Y	N	N
5 Winstead	N	Y	N	N	Y	18 Santangelo	N	N	Y	N	N	18 Whalley	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	6 Slack	N	N	Y	N	N
MISSOURI						21 Zelenko	N	N	Y	N	N	Philadelpia City						2 Stroggers	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Bolling	N	N	Y	N	N	25 Fino	/	N	/	N	N	1 Barrett	X	N	Y	N	Y	1 Moore	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Cannon	N	N	?	N	/	4 Halpern	Y	N	Y	N	N	3 Byrne	N	N	Y	N	N	WISCONSIN					
6 Hull	N	N	Y	N	Y	17 Lindsay	Y	N	Y	Y	N	2 Granahan	N	N	Y	N	N	9 Johnson	N	N	Y	N	N
8 Ichord	N	N	Y	N	N	15 Ray	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	5 Green	N	N	Y	?	N	2 Kastenmeier	N	N	Y	N	N
10 Jones	N	Y	N	N	Y	NORTH CAROLINA						4 Nix	N	N	Y	N	N	5 Reuss	N	N	Y	N	N
1 Karsten	N	N	Y	N	N	9 Alexander	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Toll	N	N	Y	N	N	4 Zablocki	N	N	Y	N	N
11 Moulder	N	N	/	N	N	1 Bonner	N	N	Y	Y	N	RHODE ISLAND						8 Byrnes	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
4 Randall	N	N	Y	N	N	4 Cooley	N	N	Y	Y	N	2 Fogarty	Y	N	Y	N	N	7 Laird	Y	Y	N	Y	/
3 Sullivan	N	N	Y	N	N	2 Fountain	N	Y	Y	Y	N	1 St. Germain	N	N	Y	N	Y	10 O'Konski	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
2 Curtis	/	Y	N	Y	Y	3 Henderson	N	Y	Y	N	N	SOUTH CAROLINA						1 Schadeberg	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
7 Hall	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	8 Kitchin	N	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Ashmore	X	Y	N	Y	Y	3 Thomson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
MONTANA						6 Kornegay	N	N	Y	N	N	3 Dorn	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	6 Van Pelt	Y	Y	N	Y	/
1 Olsen	N	N	Y	N	N	7 Lennon	Y	N	Y	N	Y	5 Hemphill	N	N	Y	N	N	WYOMING					
2 Battin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y													AL Harrison	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

Democrats in this type; *Republicans in Italics*

House Test Votes on Water Compact, Aid to Education, Juvenile Delinquency, Public vs. Private Power

6. HR 30. Grant the consent of Congress to a compact creating an interstate-federal commission to administer the water resources of the Northeastern United States. Baldwin (R Calif.) motion to recommit the bill with instructions to limit the participation of the Federal Government to non-voting representatives whose actions would not be binding on any federal agency. Rejected 140-261 (D 1-233; R 139-28), Aug. 2, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.
7. HR 8890. Emergency Educational Aid Act of 1961, authorizing a one-year, \$325 million program of school construction assistance; a one-year continuation of student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act, with a \$90 million authorization; and a one-year extension of the program of federal grants for schools in areas impacted with federal employees, with a \$201 million authorization. Hebert (D La.) question, under Calendar Wednesday procedure, on whether the bill should be considered. Consideration rejected 170-242 (D 164-82; R 6-160), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.
8. HR 8028. Authorize \$10 million annually for three years for conducting pilot projects and training personnel for controlling

juvenile delinquency. Griffin (R Mich.) amendment to limit all pilot demonstration projects to the District of Columbia. Rejected 187-217 (D 55-188; R 132-29), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.

9. HR 9706. Public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1962. Jensen (R Iowa) motion to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce by \$4,225,000 the appropriation for construction of transmission lines in connection with the Upper Colorado River Basin project and prohibit construction by the Federal Government of lines connecting the three major hydroelectric power plants in the project with their major markets. Rejected 182-225 (D 41-202; R 141-23), Sept. 13, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a smaller federal role.

10. HR 7576. Authorize \$328,440,000 for construction by the Atomic Energy Commission. Adoption of the conference report, which authorized \$58 million to add electric generating facilities to a plutonium production reactor at Hanford, Wash. Report rejected 157-251 (D 146-95; R 11-156), Sept. 13, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting a larger federal role.

TOTAL						DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN					
Vote No.	6	7	8	9	10	Vote No.	6	7	8	9	10	Vote No.	6	7	8	9	10
Yea	140	170	187	182	157	Yea	1	164	55	41	146	Yea	139	6	132	141	11
Nay	261	242	217	225	251	Nay	233	82	188	202	95	Nay	28	160	29	23	156

6 7 8 9 10						6 7 8 9 10						6 7 8 9 10						- KEY -					
ALABAMA						ALABAMA						ALABAMA						Y Record Vote For (yea).					
3 Andrews	N	Y	Y	N	Y	19 Holifield	N	Y	N	N	Y	AL Inouye	N	Y	N	N	Y	✓ Paired For.					
1 Boykin	N	N	?	Y	?	17 King	N	Y	N	N	Y	IDAHO						± Announced For, CQ Poll For.					
7 Elliott	N	Y	N	N	Y	26 Roosevelt	N	Y	N	N	Y	2 Harding	N	Y	N	N	Y	N Record Vote Against (nay).					
2 Grant	N	Y	Y	N	N	16 Bell	N	Y	Y	Y	N	1 Pfost	N	Y	N	N	Y	X Paired Against.					
9 Huddleston	N	N	Y	N	N	21 Hiestand	Y	N	Y	Y	N	ILLINOIS						- Announced Against, CQ Poll Against.					
8 Jones	N	Y	N	N	Y	18 Hosmer	Y	N	Y	Y	N	25 Gray	N	?	N	N	N	? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.					
5 Rains	-	✓	X	N	Y	24 Lipscomb	Y	N	Y	Y	N	21 Mack	N	Y	N	N	Y						
4 Roberts	?	Y	N	N	Y	15 McDonough	Y	N	Y	Y	N	24 Price	N	Y	N	N	Y						
6 Selden	N	N	Y	N	N	25 Rousselot	Y	N	Y	Y	N	23 Shipley	N	Y	N	N	Y						
ALASKA						20 Smith	Y	N	Y	Y	N	16 Anderson	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
AL Rivers	N	✓	N	N	Y	COLORADO						17 Arends	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
ARIZONA						4 Aspinall	N	N	N	N	Y	19 Chipfield	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
2 Udall M.	N	Y	N	N	Y	1 Rogers	N	Y	N	N	Y	20 Findley	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
1 Rhodes	✓	N	Y	Y	N	3 Chenoweth	N	N	Y	N	N	14 Hoffman	Y	N	✓	Y	N						
ARKANSAS						2 Dominick	Y	N	Y	Y	N	15 Mason	✓	N	?	Y	N						
5 Alford	N	N	Y	N	N	CONNECTICUT						18 Michel	Y	N	Y	N	N						
1 Gathings	N	N	Y	N	N	1 Daddario	N	Y	N	Y	N	22 Springer	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
4 Harris	N	N	N	N	N	3 Gioia	N	Y	N	N	N	Chicago Cook County	N	✓	X	N	✓						
2 Mills	N	N	N	N	N	AL Kowalski	N	Y	N	Y	N	1 Dawson	N	✓	X	N	✓						
6 Norrell C.	?	X	✓	N	N	5 Monagan	N	Y	N	Y	N	12 Finnegan	N	Y	N	N	Y						
3 Trimble	N	Y	N	N	Y	2 Seely-Brown	N	N	Y	Y	N	5 Kluczynski	N	Y	N	N	Y						
CALIFORNIA						4 Sibal	N	N	Y	Y	N	7 Libonati	N	Y	N	N	Y						
7 Cohelan	N	Y	N	N	Y	DELAWARE						3 Murphy	N	Y	N	N	Y						
14 Hagen	N	Y	N	N	Y	AL McDowell	N	Y	N	N	Y	6 O'Brien	N	Y	N	N	Y						
2 Johnson	N	Y	N	N	Y	FLORIDA						2 O'Hara	N	Y	N	N	Y						
11 McFall	N	Y	N	N	Y	2 Bennett	N	N	N	N	Y	11 Pucinski	N	Y	N	N	Y						
1 Miller C.	N	Y	N	N	Y	4 Fascell	N	N	N	N	Y	8 Rostenkowski	N	Y	N	N	Y						
8 Miller G.P.	N	Y	N	N	Y	7 Haller	N	N	Y	Y	N	9 Yates	N	Y	N	N	Y						
3 Moss	N	Y	N	N	Y	5 Herlong	N	N	Y	Y	N	13 Church	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
29 Saund	N	Y	N	N	Y	8 Matthews	N	N	Y	Y	N	10 Collier	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
5 Shelley	N	Y	N	N	Y	6 Rogers	N	N	Y	Y	N	4 Deruinski	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
27 Sheppard	±	Y	X	N	Y	3 Sikes	N	N	Y	Y	N	INDIANA											
12 Sisk	N	Y	N	N	Y	1 Cramer	Y	N	Y	Y	N	3 Brademas	N	Y	N	N	Y						
6 Baldwin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GEORGIA						8 Denton	N	Y	N	N	N						
10 Gubser	Y	N	Y	Y	N	8 Blitch	-	N	Y	Y	N	1 Madden	N	✓	N	N	Y						
4 Mailliard	Y	?	?	Y	Y	5 Davis J.C.	N	N	✓	Y	N	5 Roush	N	Y	N	N	Y						
13 Teague	Y	N	Y	Y	N	7 Davis J.W.	X	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Adair	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
28 Utt	Y	N	Y	Y	N	4 Flynt	?	N	Y	Y	N	7 Bray	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
30 Wilson	Y	N	Y	Y	N	3 Forrester	N	N	Y	Y	N	11 Bruce	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
9 Younger	Y	N	Y	Y	N	1 Hagan	N	Y	Y	N	N	2 Halleck	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
Los Angeles Co.						9 Landrum	N	Y	Y	N	N	10 Harvey	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
22 Corman	N	Y	N	N	Y	2 Pilcher	N	X	✓	Y	N	6 Roudsbush	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
23 Doyle	N	Y	N	N	Y	10 Stephens	N	Y	Y	N	N	9 Wilson	Y	N	Y	Y	N						
						6 Vinson	N	Y	Y	✓	?												

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics



Committee Roundup

FARM BILL TESTIMONY

COMMITTEE -- Senate Government Operations.
ACTION -- Oct. 10 issued a report (S Rept 1116) of the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee on allegations that Agriculture Department officials had threatened witnesses in attempts to coerce favorable testimony on the Administration farm bill.

The report said a preliminary investigation by the Subcommittee had shown that there were a number of people affiliated with various organizations "who purportedly had received threats or who allegedly had been intimidated or coerced" by Agriculture Department officials in connection with their proposed testimony against the farm bill. Because of "conflicting statements" in the affidavits taken by the Subcommittee staff, the report said, the Subcommittee met Aug. 15 in executive session and heard nine witnesses.

As a result of the hearing, the report said, the Subcommittee concluded that the allegations of threats were not substantiated. The Subcommittee said, however, that while Assistant Agriculture Secretary John P. Duncan, Jr. did not threaten cattle industry spokesmen, he did use "a not too subtle approach" in trying to win support for the farm bill. The report also said that Assistant Agriculture Secretary C. James T. Ralph, "in his zeal to further the cause of the Administration's bill, did in fact 'needle' certain officials of the Utah Cattlemen's Assn.

CIVIL DEFENSE

COMMITTEE -- House Government Operations.

ACTION -- Sept. 21 issued a report (H Rept 1249) generally praising the civil defense program announced by President Kennedy May 25, but making "certain critical observations" and suggesting that the program was "only a beginning". The report was based on a study by the Military Operations Subcommittee and hearings held Aug. 1-4 and 7-9. (Weekly Report p. 1393) (For fact sheet on the Committee's 1960 civil defense report, see 1960 Weekly Report p. 1643)

In his May 25 Special Message to Congress on Urgent National Needs, the President announced he was assigning authority for certain phases of the civil defense program, including the fallout shelter program, to the Secretary of Defense, and reconstituting the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as a small staff agency designated the Office of Emergency Planning. The President requested and received \$207.6 million in fiscal 1962 appropriations for Defense Department civil defense activities, of which \$169.3 million was earmarked to locate, mark and stock fallout shelter space in existing public and private buildings. (Weekly Report p. 1379)

The report cautioned the President against completely "writing off" blast shelters as opposed to fallout shelters. It said that civil defense should not be justified on too narrow a base, as if it were designed solely for an unlikely or exceptional situation. Civil defense, the report said, is an integral part of the nation's defense and "an essential part of the deterrent strength" of the nation.

The Committee said the assignment of civil defense functions to the Defense Department could lead to "conflicting values and objectives" and warned that "civil defense must not encroach upon nor interfere with performance of vital military missions."

The report said the nation could survive a nuclear attack and restore a "viable economy" and "free institutions," but only if it was prepared through civil defense. The Defense Department, it said, must develop an optimum shelter plan which recognizes that underground shelters are more effective against radiation than aboveground shelters and that group shelters are "much more effective" for survival and recovery than individual family shelters. The report said that \$20 billion would build a system of underground shelters, fully equipped and stocked with food and other essentials, to provide for the shelter needs of all Americans. Besides protecting against radioactive fallout, the Committee said that underground shelters also would offer "considerable protection against fire and blast effects."

In a preface to the report, the Committee warned against "fly-by-night operators" who sold "expensive or useless gadgets and devices under the label of civil defense." Before signing a contract for construction of a home shelter, the Committee advised that local civil defense officials be consulted.

In additional views, Reps. Hoffman (R Mich.), Meader (R Mich.), Brown (R Ohio), Langen (R Minn.) and Anderson (R Ill.) agreed to the need for an "optimum shelter plan," but said high Administration officials "have been reported as being apathetic to home shelters." Of 14 top officials, they said, "not a single one has as yet built a home shelter."

NLRB STUDY

COMMITTEE -- House Education and Labor.

ACTION -- Sept. 26 issued a staff report of the National Labor Relations Board Subcommittee criticizing the operations of the NLRB as detrimental to the encouragement of collective bargaining and making recommendations for reforms in the Board's operating procedures.

The report, based on hearings held during May and June 1961, cited NLRB delays in processing election and unfair labor practice cases as "by all odds" the greatest impediment to encouragement of collective bargaining. It said delays in enforcement of NLRB orders, the absolute authority of the General Counsel in issuing unfair labor practice complaints, and existing discretionary injunction practices also generally worked to the disadvantage of labor unions.

The report identified bureaucratic "redtape" and ever-increasing caseloads as major contributing factors to "prolonged" NLRB delays. It said it regretted that the House July 20 had rejected the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 for the NLRB. The Subcommittee recommended immediate adoption of new administrative procedures to speed up the Board's operations in matters which did not require legislative action. (Weekly Report p. 1259)

The report said "the vast policy shift which began in 1953" was "unfortunate" and reflected the sympathy of new Board members "with antiunion views."

In minority views, Reps. Clare E. Hoffman (R Mich.) and John M. Ashbrook (R Ohio) said the purpose of the Subcommittee hearings "was not to make an objective study but rather to furnish a forum from which the so-called Eisenhower board" could be "castigated and condemned."

In separate views, Rep. Robert P. Griffin (R Mich.) said he concurred with the minority opinion, but agreed with the Subcommittee majority that "the Board should consider some internal reforms" to expedite case handling.

COMMUNICATION SATELLITES

COMMITTEE -- House Science and Astronautics.

ACTION -- Oct. 11 released a report (H Rept 1279) on the commercial applications of proposed space communications systems. The report was based, in part, on eight days of hearings in July 1961. (For Fact Sheet on communications satellites, see Weekly Report p. 1517)

The report said the U.S. would gain prestige if it were the first nation to develop a global communication system using satellites because "the image of a modern industrial nation is to a considerable extent reflected by its achievements in space technology."

The report said cost estimates for establishing an operational communications satellite system ranged from \$100 million to \$500 million, but the great demand for the system warranted the expense. It estimated that demands on the current international telephone and telegraph system would exceed the capacity of existing facilities by 1965.

The Committee recommended that the Government "retain maximum flexibility" in considering the role of private industry in ownership and operation of the program. It urged that research and development not be delayed because of "secondary considerations" such as "business and financial arrangements."

The Committee said private industry participation in the program should be encouraged, but "the appearance of American exploitation simply for profits must be avoided and private gain must not be permitted to dictate the design, type or capacity of the system."

The report recommended that the Defense Department continue to develop a separate military space communication system in order to avoid charges that the U.S. system was used for "militaristic" purposes. The Committee also recommended that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration continue to study and develop different types of satellite systems which might be used in the communications satellite program until the superiority of one was clearly established.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 13 -- Nine international communications companies submitted to the Federal Communications Commission a report recommending a plan to form a non-profit U.S. Satellite Corp. to develop, construct, operate and manage a satellite communications system. The satellites would not be owned by the combine, but would be owned directly by the member companies, and the ground stations would be individually owned by the participating companies. The board of directors would consist of two representatives of each company with an investment of \$500,000 or more, three representatives appointed by the President, and

one representative chosen by firms leasing, but not investing in, satellite facilities.

Western Union Telegraph Co., in minority views, said the non-profit corporation might be dominated by one large firm which could use its large investment as a leverage to influence the affairs of the corporation. Western Union supported a plan to broaden ownership of the satellite program by setting up a public stock corporation to own and operate both the satellites and ground stations.

The companies that presented the proposal: American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; Western Union; American Cable & Radio Corp.; Hawaiian Telephone Co.; Press Wireless, Inc.; Radio Corp. of Puerto Rico; RCA Communications Inc.; South Puerto Rico Sugar Corp.; and Tropical Radio Telegraph Co.

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler (D N.Y.) in an Oct. 17 letter to FCC Chairman Newton N. Minow opposed the plan because the recommendations excluded domestic communications companies, equipment manufacturers and other participants from ownership and created a "probability" of ultimate dominance by AT&T.

DRUG HEARINGS

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

RESUMED HEARINGS -- On a bill (S 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to drug manufacture and distribution. (Weekly Report p. 1312) Testimony:

Sept. 13 -- Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff supported provisions of S 1552 permitting the Federal Drug Administration to prohibit the sale of useless drugs. Ribicoff opposed a section of the bill requiring all drug firms to be licensed by HEW. He said careful inspection and supervision would protect the public from poor quality products.

Sept. 15 -- Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division Lee Loevinger supported the objectives of S 1552, but said the Department would take no position on a provision stipulating how long a patent-holder should retain full monopoly on a product. (S 1552 would permit the original patent holder to hold a monopoly on a drug for the first three years of the 17 year patent duration. During the remaining 14 years the patent-holding firm would be required to license other firms to produce the drug in return for 8 percent of the licensee's sales of the drug.)

Oct. 16 -- Testimony on patent aspects of S 1552: Patent Commissioner David L. Ladd opposed that part of S 1552 permitting HEW to decide whether a modification of a drug produced a "significantly greater therapeutic effect" than the original product to warrant a new patent. Ladd said the provision should be a Patent Office responsibility.

American Institute of Chemists President Johan Bjorksten opposed the bill. He said limiting full patent monopolies to three years would take away the period of protection needed to warrant the "research chances" which produced new discoveries.

Oct. 17 -- Thomas M. Ferrill Jr. of the National Assn. of Manufacturers opposed S 1552.

Robert B. Larson of the American Patent Law Assn. said the bill would "destroy the incentive to invent, limit the incentive to disclose, and kill the incentive to invest in new drug inventions...."

NO RECLAMATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED THIS YEAR

For the first time in eight years, Congress failed to authorize any new reclamation projects this year. Congress has authorized at least one reclamation project each year since 1953, when it also failed to authorize a project. Coincidentally, both 1953 and 1961 marked the start of new Administrations, so agency reports to Congress on prospective authorizations were slowed by personnel changes, particularly at the Interior Department and the Budget Bureau.

Shortly after the Kennedy Administration took over on Jan. 20, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, Chairman Clinton P. Anderson (D N.M.) of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall (D Colo.) of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee agreed to give top priority this year to three prospective reclamation project authorizations: the Burns Creek project in Idaho, the Navajo-San Juan-Chama projects in New Mexico, and the Fryngpan-Arkansas project in Colorado. It was agreed that the House would act first on the Burns Creek and Fryngpan-Arkansas bills, the Senate first on the Navajo-San Juan-Chama bill. But all three project authorizations, and others as well, were stymied because of the bitter battle which developed in the House Reclamation Subcommittee over the Burns Creek project. (See below)

Status of Projects

The Senate in 1961 passed two bills authorizing reclamation projects:

Navajo-San Juan-Chama: S 107, introduced by Anderson and Sen. Dennis Chavez (D N.M.) passed March 28 by voice vote. Hearings were held on the bill March 15, and it was reported to the Senate by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee March 22. The bill authorized the construction of two projects: a \$135 million non-reimbursable project in northwestern New Mexico to irrigate 110,630 acres of Navajo Indian land, and an \$86 million transmountain diversion project to divert 110,000 acre-feet of water annually from the San Juan Basin to the Rio Grande Basin in New Mexico to provide supplemental water to 120,900 acres of land in the Rio Grande Basin and to provide 57,300 acre feet of additional water for municipal and industrial uses at Albuquerque, N.M. Hearings were held on S 107 and companion House measures by the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee from April 24-26, and a clean bill (HR 7596) was reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on June 7.

Mid-State: S 970, introduced by Sens. Carl T. Curtis (R Neb.) and Roman L. Hruska (R Neb.) passed the Senate by voice vote on Sept. 21. Hearings were held May 25, and it was reported Sept. 7. If enacted, this bill would authorize the construction of an \$81,467,000 reclamation project along the Platte river to provide irrigation to 140,000 acres of land in Buffalo, Hall and Merrick counties in southcentral Nebraska.

Two other reclamation bills were reported by committees. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported June 21 by a 19-4 vote HR 2206 introduced by Aspinall, following hearings on the bill May 15.

The bill authorized the Fryngpan-Arkansas (River) project, a \$170 million transmountain diversion project in Colorado.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Aug. 30 reported S 230 introduced by Sens. Quentin N. Burdick (D N.D.) and Milton R. Young (R N.D.) to authorize a \$183 million Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, following hearings on the bill June 21. Thus, a total of five reclamation project authorizations is ready for Senate or House action in 1962.

A Power Project?

The House Interior Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Walter Rogers (D Texas), held hearings March 16, April 17-18, and May 18 on HR 36, introduced by Rep. Gracie Pfof (D Idaho) and HR 378 by Rep. Ralph R. Harding (D Idaho) to authorize the construction of a 234,000 acre-foot reregulating reservoir and a 90,000 kilowatt power plant and other works costing \$45,430,000 at Burns Creek in the Upper Snake River Valley of Idaho. As in the 86th Congress, the Burns Creek project again this year became snarled in a public-vs.-private power controversy. The bills were shelved for the session late in May when the Subcommittee was unable to muster a quorum to mark up the legislation.

Witnesses representing the Bureau of Reclamation, Idaho farmers and rural cooperatives claimed that the Burns Creek project is necessary to allow full power production at Palisades dam on the Snake River above the Burns Creek site; to reregulate the waterflow on the river; to provide an additional 100,000 acre feet of water storage at the Burns Creek dam to assure supplemental water to finish crops in the Upper Snake River Valley in drought years; and to provide power for irrigation pumping, which will bring 65,000 acres of new land into production.

Only 3 percent of the Burns Creek project costs is allocated to irrigation; 97 percent is allocated for repayment from net power revenues. By incorporating Burns Creek and the Palisades project (authorized by Congress in 1950) into one multiple-purpose project and by lengthening the repayment period on Palisades by 20 years, Burns Creek power rates would be the same as those on the Palisades project, although Burns Creek power would cost more to generate than Palisades power. Critics claimed this proved that Burns Creek was a high cost public project which could not be justified as a separate project.

The State of Wyoming, coal operators and coal miners in the Wyoming-Utah area, the Utah Power & Light Co., and the Idaho Power Co. opposed it on the grounds that it was a public power project for which authorization was being sought under the guise of reclamation. They claimed it would set a precedent in future years. Burns Creek supporters said that it was not unusual for the Bureau of Reclamation to build power dams as units of over-all multiple-purpose projects, and that five such dams have been authorized on the Colorado river as a part of the over-all water development of the Colorado River Basin.

KHRUSHCHEV STATEMENTS

Two statements by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev in the course of a six-and-a-half-hour address opening the 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party Oct. 17 elicited prompt responses from officials in Washington:

BERLIN DEADLINE -- The Soviet Premier said he would withdraw his deadline for a German peace treaty this year if the Western powers demonstrated a willingness to negotiate on Germany and Berlin. He insisted that he had not laid down any ultimatum in the Berlin dispute.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk at a press conference the following day said the dropping of the Berlin deadline "may serve to reduce tensions somewhat," but that the Russian Premier's "general observations" indicated little change in Soviet policy toward Germany. He said that while some of Khrushchev's remarks appeared moderate in tone, others sounded uncompromising.

K-BOMB -- The Soviet Premier said the U.S.S.R. would probably complete its series of nuclear weapons tests Oct. 30 or 31 by exploding a 50-megaton hydrogen bomb. Within 12 hours, the White House issued a statement calling upon the Soviet Union to reconsider its plans "to explode a giant nuclear bomb -- the equivalent of 50 million tons of TNT." The statement said such a test could serve "no legitimate purpose" since full-scale tests were not necessary to develop 50-megaton bombs, and that the planned detonation, while adding "a mass of additional radioactive fallout", could only be designed to serve "some unconfessed political purpose."

In the course of his opening day review and a second six-hour speech Oct. 18 Khrushchev announced a year's halt in initiation of new investment projects (an implicit admission of a capital shortage); said the Soviet Union would fulfill "and even overfulfill" its Seven-Year Plan ending in 1965; and was moving toward a "world-historical victory in peaceful competition with the United States"; said "American capitalism has passed its prime and is declining"; outlined a 20-year program to give the U.S.S.R. the world's greatest industrial productivity and highest living standards; and announced the exile of Albania from the international Communist movement for practicing a Stalinist personality cult.

MENTAL RETARDATION

President Kennedy Oct. 18 told a newly-appointed, 24-member panel on mental retardation, "we can make easier the lives of many, many thousands of people and their families," and efforts would be made to coordinate the panel's work with studies made in other countries. The panel, headed by Dr. Leonard May of New York, executive director of the Assn. for the Aid of Crippled Children, was appointed shortly after the President announced at his Oct. 11 news conference his intention to create such a group. (Weekly Report p. 741)

In an Oct. 11 statement, Mr. Kennedy said: there were approximately five million mentally retarded persons in the U.S., and the nation "too long" had postponed

an intensive search for solutions to the problem; retardation was not a disease but a symptom of a disease, of an injury or some obscure failure of development; the goal should be to prevent it or, failing this, to provide equal opportunity for social development for this group; the panel would study the scope of the problem, adequacy of present programs, possibilities for prevention or cure, and report by Dec. 31, 1962; an understanding of the motivation and effect of human behavior might come from research in this field and this offered "the hope of fostering the rational behavior of nations."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy Oct. 16 announced that the Illinois Central, the Southern and the Louisville and Nashville railroads had agreed to end racial segregation at all of their terminal facilities in the South.

The action had been announced earlier the same day by the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. following a meeting with President Kennedy. King said that his purpose in going to the White House had been to propose that the President issue a "second Emancipation Proclamation" ending all forms of segregation. The Negro leader said he had also urged the President to issue an Executive Order banning segregation in housing and to direct the Civil Rights Commission to investigate voting and other discrimination in Mississippi.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT: The National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing Sept. 27 requested President Kennedy to issue an Executive Order banning discrimination in all housing receiving federal aid. (Weekly Report p. 1714)

DIRKSEN CRITICISM

Senate Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.) Oct. 18 said the Kennedy Administration is "still floundering" and has not solved "the question of our national direction."

He said the "New Frontier seeks firmly to face up to the Communist menace abroad by toying with the collectivist view at home," and it was "an outlandish heresy" to "style itself as the 'party of hope'".

Dirksen Oct. 18 said he would oppose any attempt in 1962 to set up a joint Congressional watchdog committee to supervise operations of the C.I.A.

YUGOSLAVIA JET SALE

Military aides of former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy -- not the principals themselves -- reviewed the impending sale of 130 F-86D jet fighters to Yugoslavia, the White House stated Oct. 17.

Following reports of the jet sale in Texas newspapers and criticism of the transaction Oct. 13 by Sen. John Tower (R Texas), the State Dept. Oct. 13 confirmed that the sale of surplus fighters had been completed in March 1961. The same day, Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D Wash.) also criticized the plane deal.

Oct. 15 newspaper reports quoted "Administration

sources" as saying former President Eisenhower had explained the proposed sale to President Kennedy. Mr. Eisenhower in Newark, N.J. Oct. 17 denied he had discussed the matter with Mr. Kennedy but later in the day said the sale was "in the best interest of the United States."

The White House Oct. 17 said that the plane transaction with Yugoslavia had in fact been reviewed by Presidential military aides at the time of the transition, and only carried forward a policy toward Yugoslavia followed by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- The House Select Committee on Export Control Oct. 18 announced it would begin closed hearings Oct. 25 on exports to Soviet bloc nations. The Senate Judiciary Internal Security Subcommittee Oct. 19 announced it would hold similar open hearings Oct. 23 and 24.

ADMINISTRATION SPEAKING TOURS

President Kennedy has planned two Western speaking engagements, the first for Nov. 16 in Seattle at the Univ. of Washington and the second for Nov. 17 at Phoenix at a dinner honoring Sen. Carl Hayden (D Ariz.) on the occasion of his 50th anniversary as a Member of Congress.

The White House Oct. 4 announced that five Cabinet officers would participate in regional conferences Nov. 7-21 in order to explain to the public the impact and potential of legislation enacted in 1961 and get the public's suggestions for 1962 proposals.

The conferences, to be attended by state and municipal officials, civic groups and interested citizens, the announcement said, would cover the following topics: Full Employment and Economic Growth, Opportunities for Our Cities, Opportunities for Youth, and Opportunities for Senior Citizens. In addition, the conferences were scheduled to cover such sub-topics as community development, juvenile delinquency, education, recreation, metropolitan planning, fiscal and monetary policies, minimum wages, physical fitness and the Peace Corps. Other conferences dealing with agriculture and conservation might be scheduled at a later date for other cities, the announcement said.

Designated to lead the two-day conferences were Secretaries Stewart L. Udall of Interior, Orville L. Freeman of Agriculture, Luther H. Hodges of Commerce, Arthur J. Goldberg of Labor and Abraham A. Ribicoff of Health, Education and Welfare. Staff members would also participate, the announcement said.

The schedule for the conferences was as follows: Nov. 7-8 -- Chicago and St. Louis; Nov. 9-10 -- Houston and Nashville; Nov. 14-15 -- Detroit and Cleveland; Nov. 16-17 -- New York and Philadelphia; Nov. 20-21 -- San Francisco and Los Angeles.

BANKERS CONVENTION

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, in an Oct. 17 address to the annual convention of the American Bankers Assn. meeting in San Francisco, said that President Kennedy "intends to submit to Congress....a balanced budget for fiscal 1963." (President Kennedy in his Oct. 11 press conference said the next budget would be balanced "unless military increases, and only military increases, threaten that object. Weekly Report p. 1744)

In the same speech, Dillon said the deficit for fiscal 1962 probably would be about \$6.8 billion. The \$1.5 billion in addition to the \$5.3 billion deficit predicted July 26 by the Budget Bureau (Weekly Report p. 1303), he said, would result from Congress' failure to increase postal rates and the sharp increase in price supports demanded as a result of record crops.

Dillon also said he hoped the nation's balance of payments deficit for 1961 could be held to "not much more than \$2 billion." In 1960, the deficit ran to more than \$3 billion. (Weekly Report p. 5)

George Champion of the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, Oct. 16 told the convention that the Federal Government should cut its taxes by 10 percent and reduce the public debt by \$50 billion.

Roy L. Reirson of the Bankers Trust Co., New York, Oct. 18 said that wage increases should be limited to 2 percent a year in order to protect the international position of the dollar.



Pressures On Congress

CONGRESS' 1961 RECORD

Since Congress adjourned Sept. 27, its achievements have been analyzed and rated by several organizations. Following are summaries of some of the reports:

Americans for Democratic Action -- Sept. 30 said the session was "at best one of callous expediency." It said that the legislative formula followed in 1961 -- one of "accommodation and compromise" with Republicans and Southern Democrats -- was the same that had been pursued by the Eisenhower Administration. The conclusions were based on an analysis of Members' voting records on 10 key votes ranging from foreign aid to public power. The analysis showed that on the average the House in 1961 voted 49 percent and the Senate 55 percent liberal, as defined by the ADA. The study showed that 24 Senators -- 23 Democrats and 1 Republican (Jacob K. Javits -- N.Y.) -- had "perfect" voting records and 98 Representatives -- 97 Democrats and 1 Republican (Seymour Halpern -- N.Y.) -- had "perfect" records.

AFL-CIO -- Sept. 30 said the session was a success -- the best in 25 years. It gave the President the credit for most of the legislative achievements and blamed failures on conservative opponents.

Council of State Chambers of Commerce -- Oct. 3 said the session was the "freest spending session in the nation's peacetime or cold war history." It predicted that the effect of the session would "not only be a \$7 billion increase in expenditures" over the original budget for fiscal 1962, but also a further rise to at least a \$90 billion budget for fiscal 1963.

PRESSURE POINTS

● **JOB DISCRIMINATION:** The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in its September issue of "Labor Relations Letter" asked businessmen to forward to the Chamber information about complaints filed with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The Chamber said it was studying allegations that professional agitators were touring the country provoking incidents under the pretext of discrimination and then filing complaints with

the Committee. (Weekly Report p. 1722)

● **PUBLIC EMPLOYEE UNIONS** -- President Arnold S. Zander of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) Oct. 11 predicted that the number of public employees belonging to labor unions would triple during the next two years. He said a study currently being made by Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg on labor unions and the federal service probably would stimulate the increase.

Lobbyist Registrations

Eleven new registrations filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act were made public Sept. 15, 1961-Oct. 13, 1961. (For earlier registrations, see Weekly Report p. 1645).

Registrations are listed by category (with employers listed alphabetically): Business, Citizens, Farm, Foreign, Individuals, Labor, Military and Veterans Groups, and Professional. Where certain information is not listed (such as legislative interest or compensation), the information was not filed by the Registrant.

Business Groups

● **EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT** -- AMERICAN FOOTBALL LEAGUE, 1111 Southland Center, Dallas 1, Texas. Filed 9/14/61.

2. Registrant -- HAROLD O. LOVRE LAW OFFICES, Ex.-Rep. Harold O. Lovre (R S.D. 1949-57) and Philip M. DeVany, 639 Woodward Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 9/14/61.

Legislative Interest -- "All legislation dealing with sports, directly or indirectly and more particularly professional football."

Previous Registrations -- American Trucking Assns., National Milk Producers Federation (1957 Almanac p. 742, 760); Chicago Mercantile Exchange, Porter Bros. Corp. (1958 Almanac p. 635, 642).

● **EMPLOYER** -- Common Carrier Conference - Irregular Route, Inc., 1616 P St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- HENRY A.S. van DAALLEN, Jr., 1616 P St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 10/5/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Matters of interest to motor carriers over irregular routes."

Compensation -- \$100 yearly.

● **EMPLOYER** -- Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Assn. 300 Tulsa Bldg., Tulsa 3, Okla.

Registrant -- LAURENCE P. SHERFY, 1625 K St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 10/6/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Interested generally in legislation affecting the petroleum industry."

Compensation -- \$20,000 yearly.

Previous Registrations -- Sherfy was the fifth individual to register in the employ of the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Assn. since 1947.

Foreign

● **EMPLOYER** -- Salvador Schaps, Servidora Electrica, S.A., San Salvador, El Salvador.

Registrant -- SHELDON Z. KAPLAN, 817 Barr Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 10/6/61.

Legislative Interest -- "In favor of HR 1392, for the Relief of Carlos Ernesto Schaps."

Compensation -- \$500.

Previous Registrations -- Guatemala Sugar Producers Assn. (1960 Almanac p. 681).

Individuals

● **EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT** -- CHARLES MCKENNA, 711 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 9/20/61.

Legislative Interest -- "...for passage of bills that will help the motor carriers, against bills that will further restrict them and aid competition both here and abroad."

Expenses -- Anticipated less than \$10,000 yearly.

● **EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT** -- WM. EDISON OWEN, attorney, 215 C St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 9/22/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Interested in opposing legislation directed at the taking of land owned by my client on the Maryland side of the Potomac River opposite Mount Vernon."

● **EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT** -- ARVIN E. UPTON, 1821 Jefferson Place, Washington 6, D.C. Filed 10/2/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Seeking to secure the award of a corporate charter by Act of Congress to establish the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements as the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements."

Compensation -- \$250.

Expenses -- \$25 yearly.

Labor Groups

● **EMPLOYER** -- Los Angeles City Employees Section of the California Public Employees for Social Security, 8321 Enramada, Whittier, Calif.

Registrant -- Ex.-Rep. PATRICK J. HILLINGS (R Calif. 1951-59), 3921 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles 5, Calif. Filed 9/29/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Favorable action on HR 5902 (a bill to amend Title II of the Social Security Act to permit public employees - other than policemen and firemen - to elect coverage as self-employed individuals in cases where they do not have coverage under the applicable state agreement)."

Compensation -- \$1,000 yearly.

Previous Registrations -- California-Portland Cement (1959 Almanac p. 693).

● **EMPLOYER** -- United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Bldg., Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

1. Registrant -- MELLO G. FISH, 1001 Conn. Ave., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 9/14/61.

2. Registrant -- ALEXANDER K. CHRISTIE, 1001 Conn. Ave., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 9/14/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, democracy, security, prosperity and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to those objectives."

Compensation -- \$10,500 for Fish, \$10,206.32 for Christie.

Expenses -- \$1,200.

Previous Registrations -- Fish and Christie were the eighth and ninth individuals to register in the employ of the United Steelworkers of America since 1946.



Political Notes

MICH. 1st DISTRICT PRIMARY

Democratic voters in the Michigan 1st Congressional District (Detroit) Oct. 17 nominated Lucien N. Nedzi, 36, the district Democratic chairman and a local attorney, to be the party's nominee in the Nov. 7 special election to fill the vacancy created by the Sept. 7 resignation of Rep. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz (D) to become a Federal Judge. Democratic nomination is considered tantamount to election in the district, which almost invariably votes 4-1 Democratic. (Weekly Report p. 1592)

Complete, unofficial returns showed:

Nedzi	10,063
Russell S. Brown Jr.	9,015
Lt. Gov. T. John Lesinski	6,587
John J. Kozaren	4,829
Joseph A. Lewandowski	4,421
W. Venoid Banks	3,140
State Rep. James Bradley	2,446
Anthony J. Wilkowski	1,140
J. Alexander Burchett	146

Racial issues played a major role in the final days of the campaign when Rep. Charles C. Diggs Jr. (D Mich. 13th District), a Negro, signed a letter distributed to Negro residents of the district appealing to them to vote for Brown. Enclosed in the Diggs letter was an endorsement of Brown by the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. On election day an anonymous circular was circulated in the predominantly white areas of the district carefully identifying the Negro candidates in the race and supporting Lesinski's candidacy. Lesinski disowned the circular. Gov. John B. Swainson (D) asked the Governor's Fair Campaign Practices Committee to investigate the incident and see if there were any cause for action.

The district's population is 41.4 percent Negro and approximately 22 percent of Polish extraction. Observers had believed that Negro chances of winning the seat would be enhanced by the entry of a large number of well-known Polish candidates. But Brown, the front-running Negro, failed to win a solid Negro vote because of the entry of Banks and Bradley, also Negroes, into the race.

Observers credited Nedzi's victory to his intensive door-to-door campaign and the help he received from a group of about 300 volunteer campaign workers. He was also reported to have widespread though unofficial support from organized labor. A World War II and Korean War veteran, Nedzi has been active in Democratic politics for several years. He has never before run for public office.

Nominated in the Republican primary was Walter Czarnecki, a traffic department employee of the Budd Co. He received 355 votes against 316 for Frank J. Skierski, the Republican district chairman, and 312 for Robert W. Kirchhoff, a Detroit attorney.

LA. 4th DISTRICT PRIMARY

Democratic voters in the 4th Louisiana Congressional District (Northwest, Shreveport) Oct. 28 will select a nominee to run in the Dec. 19 special election to select

a successor to the late Rep. Overton Brooks (D), who died Sept. 16. (Weekly Report p. 1645)

Candidates in the Democratic primary are Joseph D. Waggoner of Plain Dealing, La., a member of the State Board of Education and the Bossier Parrish School Board; Marvin Bass of Shreveport, a businessman and member of the Caddo Parrish School Board; George Miller, a Shreveport businessman; Mrs. Sophie Thompson, a Shreveport housewife; and Joe Monroe of Shreveport, a former radio station executive.

Local observers report that Waggoner, a vociferous segregationist, appears to be in the lead. Bass, known locally as a more moderate conservative despite his support of segregationist policies, is generally believed to be the next strongest candidate.

If no candidate receives a majority in the Oct. 28 primary, a run-off will be held Nov. 25.

The Republican candidate in the special election will be Charlton H. Lyons Sr., 69, a wealthy oilman who has served in the past as president of the Independent Petroleum Assn. of America and the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Assn., as director of the National Petroleum Council and director of the American Petroleum Council. Lyons is a strong conservative. Republicans believe they have their best chance in decades to win a Louisiana Congressional seat, and are preparing an intensive campaign. The 4th District, known as the most conservative area of the state, went Republican in the 1952, 1956 and 1960 Presidential campaigns. Brooks' vote, however, never dropped below 68.1 percent.

KENNEDY POPULARITY

The Gallup Poll Oct. 10 reported that 76 percent of the persons questioned approved of the way President Kennedy was handling his job after nine months in the White House. At a similar point in their administrations, former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman received approval of 65 percent and 63 percent respectively.

President Kennedy's approval ratings have ranged from a high of 83 percent in late April after the Cuban invasion to a low of 71 percent in July.

FULBRIGHT TO RUN

Sen. J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.) Oct. 9 said he will seek re-election to a fourth Senate term in 1962 "unless it is obvious the people of Arkansas no longer want me to represent them." Fulbright said he was aware of some dissatisfaction among Arkansas voters because of his involvement in foreign affairs.

Fulbright is expected to face opposition in the July 31 Democratic primary from either Gov. Orval E. Faubus or Rep. Dale Alford (5th Dist.).

BLATNIK ANNOUNCEMENT

Rep. John A. Blatnik (D Minn.) Oct. 6 said he preferred to run for Governor of Minnesota if the state Legislature fails to redistrict the state. (Weekly Report p. 1233)

PUERTO RICAN ENJOYS ALL PRIVILEGES EXCEPT THE VOTE

Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, 66, Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington, has an office in the New House Office Building on Capitol Hill, acts as Senator and Representative of his "district" -- the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico -- and enjoys many of the privileges and perquisites of a Member of Congress, except the vote.

In a Sept. 12 interview, Dr. Fernós put it this way: "Although in fact most of my time is taken by Congressional duties, by law I am not a Member of Congress. The law provides for the election of a Resident Commissioner who is supposed to be recognized as the spokesman for Puerto Rico by all branches of Government."

This Fact Sheet explains the unique role played by this "extra Member of Congress."

Puerto Rico's Status

Puerto Rico's present status and relationship with the United States has been in effect since 1952. While other former territories -- Hawaii, Alaska and the Philippines -- followed a road to statehood or independence, Puerto Rico moved in its own direction. The U.S. acquired Puerto Rico in 1898 as a result of the Spanish-American war and it remained under military rule until 1900, when the U.S. appointed a Governor and executive council and let the Puerto Ricans choose a House of Delegates. In 1917, a new law gave Puerto Ricans U.S. citizenship and allowed them to elect a Senate. In 1946, President Truman appointed the first native Puerto Rican as Governor, and in 1948 the Puerto Ricans were allowed to elect their own Governor. The Commonwealth status -- the Spanish words for it are translated "Associated Free State" -- has been in effect since 1952. Under this system, Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens and elect their own local officials, they do not participate in mainland elections and their Resident Commissioner has no vote. But there is no taxation without representation -- Puerto Ricans pay no federal income taxes on income derived from sources within Puerto Rico, but are taxed locally for their treasury. They are affected by federal laws and must serve in the U.S. armed forces.

Resident Commissioner's Role

Dr. Fernós, who has been Resident Commissioner since 1946, receives the same salary as other Representatives -- \$22,500 a year -- and has a staff of seven, five in his Washington office and two in Puerto Rico. His job is to take care of his constituents, and he does this by performing many of the same services as other Congressmen. One is "casework" -- helping constituents with individual problems. Dr. Fernós lists his casework as involving pensions, military transfers, Social Security mix-ups, marriage before administrative agencies, appointments to the U.S. service academies, and letters from relatives of Puerto Ricans who live in the U.S. and get into trouble here.

Dr. Fernós serves on three House committees, each of which has jurisdiction over matters important to

Puerto Rico. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, he keeps a sharp eye on the distribution of sugar quotas; on the Armed Services Committee he deals with questions raised by the presence of U.S. bases in Puerto Rico; with the Commonwealth status established, his work in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been mainly accomplished.

Bills involving any federal-state relationship usually have a place for Puerto Rico in them, and Dr. Fernós must, as the island's sole representative, keep a close watch on legislation. He may appear before any Senate and House Committee to promote Puerto Rico's case.

Asked how he wins his way without the Congressman's traditional weapon -- his vote -- Dr. Fernós replied, "I never vote against anyone." He feels that Congress has been good to Puerto Rico and says he seldom meets any strong opposition to Puerto Rican aid.

Dr. Fernós also has a lot of work to do before the federal departments and agencies "downtown." He talks to the State Department about Cuban refugees, the Treasury about tax problems, the Federal Aviation Agency about air travel to Puerto Rico, the Pentagon about federal installations and military transfers, the Social Security Administration about individual problems, and the Agriculture Department about sugar.

This is a lot of work for one man. As Dr. Fernós put it, "If Puerto Rico were a state, I'd be five Members of the House and two Senators."

Like his Popular Democratic Party's leader, Puerto Rican Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, Dr. Fernós thinks the Commonwealth status, as opposed to statehood or independence, is an ideal arrangement. Both men argue that it is of mutual benefit to both the U.S. and Puerto Rico. He points out that Puerto Rico is a large market for the U.S., and feels that the aid given the island by the U.S. has made Puerto Rico a "showcase" for the rest of Latin America. The Republican Statehood Party feels otherwise, but Dr. Fernós brushes them off as a threat: "They were born to be a minority." The Statehood Party has been in power twice, the last time in 1940 in coalition with the now defunct Socialist Party.

Asked what he considered his most outstanding memory in the House during his 15 years of association with the House, Dr. Fernós recalled the 1954 incident when three pistol-wielding Puerto Ricans of the Nationalist Party, fired about 30 shots from a visitors gallery into a crowd of about 200 Representatives on the House floor, hitting five Members. The House adjourned immediately afterwards. Dr. Fernós asked to be recognized as the first speaker the next day. Although the shooters were the "lunatic fringe," he says, "they did it in the name of Puerto Rican independence....I didn't know how the House would react. You can imagine how I felt.... While I was just walking from my seat to the rostrum, the House rose to its feet and gave me the greatest ovation I ever heard in my life. I spoke to the House for ten minutes. Then I received another ovation. I'll never forget it."



Federal Role The question of how great or small a role the Federal Government should play in American life continues to drive a deep wedge between the Democratic and Republican parties. In its 1961 study of voting by individual Congressmen on questions of Federal Government responsibilities, CQ found that the average Democrat supported a larger Federal Role five times as often as the average Republican. The study describes the ten roll calls in each chamber CQ used to test each Member's attitude on the Federal Role and lists scores for 1961 and the 86th Congress. (Page 1751-63)

Reclamation

For the first time in eight years Congress failed to authorize a single new reclamation project to provide irrigation water in any of the 17 Western states that benefit from federal reclamation laws. New reclamation projects totalling more than \$1.5 billion -- including Navaho-San Juan-Chama in New Mexico, Mid-State in Nebraska, Fryingpan-Arkansas in Colorado, Garrison diversion in North Dakota -- are pending in Congressional committees at this time. A CQ fact sheet describes the projects and tells why there were no new authorizations in 1961. (Page 1766)

Politics

In a special primary election featuring Polish-Negro rivalries, attorney Lucien N. Nedzi, 36, won the Democratic nomination in Michigan's solidly Democratic 1st Congressional District (Detroit). The seat was vacated by Thaddeus M. Machrowicz (D) who became a Federal Judge.... An Oct. 28 primary is set to choose a Democratic nominee to succeed the late Overton Brooks (D) in the Louisiana 4th District (Shreveport, Northwest). Republicans plan to make a strong try for the seat in the Dec. 16 special election.... Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J.W. Fulbright (D) has announced he will seek reelection in 1962. (Page 1770)

In the Committees

Committees issued reports on the civil defense program, alleged pressures by Administration officials to coerce favorable testimony for the Kennedy farm bill, and the operation of the National Labor Relations Board during the Eisenhower Administration.... A House Space Committee report urging development of a global space communications system was followed by an industry committee recommendation for formation of a nonprofit corporation to develop communications satellites.... Hearings were resumed on a bill to strengthen drug antitrust laws. (Page 1764)

'Extra Member'

Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington, has an office in the New House Office Building on Capitol Hill, acts as Senator and Representative of his "district," and enjoys many of the privileges and perquisites of a Member of the Congress, except the vote. CQ describes the unique responsibilities of and role played by this "extra member" of Congress. (Page 1771)

Around the Capitol

ADMINISTRATION -- The White House announced two November speeches in the West by President Kennedy and a series of regional conferences Nov. 7 - 21, with Cabinet officers participating, to explain the public impact of 1961 legislation.... Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon said he anticipated a balanced budget for fiscal 1963.... Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy reported the end of segregation on three railroads.... And Senate Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.) said the Kennedy Administration is "still floundering". (Page 1767-68)

KHRUSHCHEV -- Two statements by Premier Khrushchev in his speech opening the 22nd Communist Party Congress -- postponing the Berlin deadline and projecting a 50-megaton nuclear test explosion -- brought prompt responses from U.S. officials.... In the controversy over the March sale of jets to Tito, the White House said aides of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Eisenhower, not the principals, reviewed the impending deal. (Page 1767)

PRESSURES -- In reviews of the first session of the 87th Congress, the ADA described it as "at best one of callous expediency"; the AFL-CIO said it was the most successful in 25 years; and the State Chambers of Commerce called it the "freest spending" in recent history. (Page 1768)

l
e
f
-
e
s
d

-
y
-
.
.
-
y
f
e
)
-

r
t
e
n
...
o
y
d

n
at
d
e
st